PB-234 442

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF EFFLUENT GUIDELINES

CEMENT INDUSTRY

SOUTHERN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

PREPARED FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

APRIL 1974

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS
National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. P.O. P4-01-03377	2.	PB 234 442

4. Title and Subtitle Economic Analysis of Effluent Guidelines: Cement Industry	5. Report Date April 1974 6.
7. Author(s) Sheldon Schaffer and Pearl Tropper	8. Performing Organization Rept. No. 3131
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Economic Research and Planning Section Southern Research Institute 2000 Ninth Avenue, South Birmingham, Alabama 35205	10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No.
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address Office of Planning and Evaluation Environmental Protection Agency Washington, D. C. 20400	13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final 14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

This report assesses the economic impact of estimated costs for water pollution controls on the cement industry. The analysis is based on a segmentation of cement plants by the alternative controls required to achieve essentially pollutant-free effluent discharges by 1977 or 1983, and on the financial ability of companies with polluting plants to meet the proposed standards. The conclusions reached, based on the data available, are that the imposition of pollution controls may strain the internal financial resources of some companies and will probably result in very limited increases in cement prices, but will not lead to plant shut-downs or increases in unemployment provided the demand for cement continues at present levels.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

cement
economic impact
leaching cement plants
nonleaching cement plants
water pollution controls

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U S Department of Commerce
Springfield VA 22151

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
National Technical Information Service Springfield, Virginia 22151	UNCLASSIFIED	70
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price 4.00 – 1.45

EPA-230/2-74-004
April 1974

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF EFFLUENT GUIDELINES: CEMENT INDUSTRY

Final Report

U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20460

Purchase Order P4-01-03377

Project 3131
Sheldon Schaffer
Pearl Tropper

PREFACE

The attached document is a contractor's study prepared with the supervision and review of the Office of Planning and Evaluation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Its purpose is to provide a basis for evaluating the potential economic impact of effluent limitations guidelines and standards of performance established by EPA pursuant to sections 304(b) and 306 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The study supplements an EPA technical "Development Document" issued in conjunction with the promulgation of guidelines and standards for point sources within this industry category. The Development Document surveys existing and potential waste treatment and control methods and technologies within this category and presents the investment and operating costs associated with various control technologies. This study supplements that analysis by estimating the broader economic effects (including product price increases, continued viability of affected plants, employment, industry growth and foreign trade) of the required application of certain of these control technologies.

This study has been submitted in fulfillment of Purchase Order No. PR-01-03377 by Southern Research Institute. Work was completed as of April, 1974. The study is based primarily upon an earlier study, also prepared by Southern Research Institute, entitled "Economic Analysis of Proposed Effluent Guidelines, Cement Industry". The earlier report was circulated in conjunction with the publication of the Federal Register of a notice of proposed rulemaking under sections 304(b) and 306 for the subject point source category. The analysis contained in the original study has been updated based upon information received during the period of time between publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking and the promulgation of the final regulation. Because of the constraints of time, the control and treatment costs analyzed in this study may not in all instances be identical to those associated with the requirements of the promulgated regulation. However, those differences, when they exist, are minor insofar as the final conclusions of the study are concerned.

This report represents the conclusions of the contractor. It has been reviewed by the Office of Planning and Evaluation and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views of the Environmental Protection Agency. The study has been considered, together with the Development Document, information received in the form of public comments on the proposed regulation, and other materials in the establishment of final effluent limitations guidelines and standards of performance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
I.	Introduction and Summary	1
II.	Industry Segments	4
	A. Types of Plants as Affected by Pollution Control Requirements	4
	1. Types of firms	9
	a. Size of firms	9
	b. Level of integration	15
	c. Number of plants	17
	d. Number of products	17
	e. Level of diversification	17
	2. Types of plants	17
	a. Size of plants	19
	b. Age of plants	19
	c. Location	22
	d. Level of technology	24
	e. Efficiency	25
	f. Level of integration in production	27
	B. Number of Plants and Employees in Each Segment	27
	C. Percent of Total Industry in Each Segment	27
	1. Number of plants as percent of total	29
	2. Production and employment as percent of totals	31
	D. Significantly Impacted Segments of the Cement Industry	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

		Page No.
III.	Financial Profiles	34
	A. Plants in Each Segment	34
	1. Annual profits before taxes	36
	2. Annual cash flow	36
	3. Market value of current assets	36
	4. Cost structure	39
	B. Distribution of Plants by Pollution Control Categories	39
	C. Constraints in Financing	39
IV.	Price Determination	40
	A. How Prices are Determined in the Cement Industry	40
	B. Likelihood of Price Changes and Possible Secondary Effects	42
V.	Assessment of Economic Impact of Pollution Control Requirements on the Cement Industry	47
	A. Best Practicable Control Technology Currently Available	47
	B. Best Available Control Technology Economically Achievable	47
	C. New Source Standards	47
	D. New Source Pretreatment Standards	47
VI.	Impact Analysis	48
	A. Price Effects	48
	1. Price increase	48
	2. Secondary effects	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

Page No.

B. Financial Effects 50

1. Profitability 51

2. Capital availability 53

C. Production Effects 53

D. Employment Effects 54

E. Resultant Community Effects 54

F. Effects on International Trade 54

VII. Limits of the Analysis and Identity of Major Information Sources 56

A. Accuracy 56

B. Range of Error 56

C. Critical Assumptions - Sensitivity to Overall Conclusions 57

D. Unanswered Questions 58

Bibliography 59

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page No.
Figure 1.	Location of Cement Mills and Cement Distribution Terminals, May, 1972	10
Figure 2.	Dispersion of Cement Plants by Water Pollution Status	23
Figure 3.	Equilibrium Under Dominant Firm Price Leadership	41
Figure 4.	Selected Prices of Bulk Cement	44
Figure 5.	Equilibrium Under Dominant Firm Price Leadership Before and After Cost Increases of Competitive Fringe Firms	45

LIST OF TABLES

		Page No.
Table 1.	Number of Cement Plants by Information Source, Manufacturing Process, Alternative Pollution Control System, and Type of Pollution	6
Table 2.	Alternative Pollution Control Systems for Achieving Essentially No Discharge of Pollutants by Cement Plants in 1977 or 1983	7
Table 3.	Nonleaching Cement Plants by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977	11
Table 4.	Cement Plants with Leachate Streams by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977 and 1983	14
Table 5.	Cement Plants by Size of Company, Capacity, Employment, and Production, Segmented by Required Pollution Controls	16
Table 6.	Cement Companies by Sales and Other Activities .	18
Table 7.	Cement Plants by Location, Capacity, and Pollution Control Categories	20
Table 8.	Cement Plants by Location, Production in Tons/ Day, and Pollution Control Categories	21
Table 9.	Cement Plants by Location, Productivity Ratio Averages, and Pollution Control Categories	26
Table 10.	Cement Plants by Location, Number of Employees, and Pollution Control Categories	28
Table 11.	Cement Industry by Number of Plants, Capacity, Production, Employment, and Productivity, Employment, and Productivity Ratios, Distributed by Pollution Control Categories	30
Table 12	Total Estimated Cumulative Capital and Operating Costs for Leaching Plants under Pollution Control Alternatives C and E, 1977-1983	33
Table 13.	Estimated Total and Average Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes, Cash Flow, and Value of Current Assets from Cement Operations of 22 Selected Companies, by Pollution Control Categories	38

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Page No.

Table 14. Estimated Costs of Meeting Pollution Control Requirements in the Cement Industry by Pollution Control Categories, 1977 and 1983 37

Table 15. Estimated Average-Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes, Cash Flow, and Value of Current Assets from Cement Operations of 22 Selected Companies, by Pollution Control Categories 38

Table 16. Cement Companies by Estimated Capital and Annual Operating Costs for Pollution Controls, 1977 and 1983, and Average-Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes and Cash Flow, 1972 52

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF EFFLUENT GUIDELINES: CEMENT INDUSTRY

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The economic impact of water pollution control requirements on the cement industry, based on the data available, may strain the internal financial resources of some companies, and will probably result in negligible increases in cement prices, depending on the type of controls required in each plant and on the proximity of polluting plants to nonpolluting plants. Plant closings and unemployment due to the imposition of pollution control requirements are not anticipated, however, so long as the demand for cement continues at projected levels.

The methodology used to determine the economic impact of pollution controls on cement producing companies included a comparison of the estimated costs of controls, both capital and annual, at the 120 cement plants reviewed in the study with estimated profitability and cash flow of cement companies per average cement plant in 1972. Price effects were measured by adding estimated average plant production costs per ton in 1973 to the incremental annual operating costs for pollution controls. Pollution control categories were determined by segmenting plants according to the quantity and type of pollutants discharged and by the availability of control technologies. These categories were based on data reported in the technical study of the cement industry prepared for the Environmental Protection Agency.[1] In the technical study, cement plants were classified as either nonleaching plants or as leaching plants, according to whether leaching systems were used for kiln-dust recovery. In this report, subcategories of these two major types of plants were included to differentiate between 1) nonleaching plants that were or were not discharging unacceptable levels of pollutants and 2) leaching plants for which control technologies were or were not available.

The total cost of achieving essentially pollutant-free discharges in the cement industry is estimated to be approximately $19 million for capital investment by 1977 and an additional

---

1. Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, report prepared by Southern Research Institute, Birmingham, June 21, 1973 (revised).

$4 million by 1983. Total annual operating costs for pollution controls are estimated at about $6 million by 1977 and an additional $1 million by 1983, for a total of about $7 million in 1983.

These estimated costs are based on water discharge data from RAPP application and Southern Research Institute surveys of 111 nonleaching plants and 9 leaching plants in the United States and Puerto Rico. No costs were estimated for the other 44 active nonleaching plants in the cement industry for which water discharge data are not available and which have been identified only by name and location. The presumption is that plants that did not apply for RAPP applications may not be polluting plants because 38 of the 44 plants for which data are not available are located in states in which RAPP applications from other cement plants are on file. Because of the lack of information regarding these 44 plants, however, only the 120 cement plants for which data are available are reviewed in this study. As a result, total estimated costs for achieving essentially pollutant-free water discharges in the cement industry are below those estimated in the Development Document,[1] because all nonleaching plants for which discharge data were unavailable or incomplete were assumed to be polluting plants in the Document.

Costs of meeting pollution control requirements range from a zero investment for the 56 nonleaching plants already meeting proposed standards, to more than $750,000 each for the eight leaching plants with the most serious pollutant problems. These latter plants are not likely to shut down, however, as they tend to be the most productive (and profitable) in the industry.

The analysis of the ability of polluting companies to meet the increased costs of pollution control was based on average per-plant company profits and cash flow in 1972, and on the assumption that financial data for 1972 will be reasonably representative of other years in this decade. Annual reports were obtained from 28 of the 35 companies for which data were available, and Standard & Poor Company stock sheets were consulted for the others. The financial analysis was based on the proportion of cement sales to total sales for only 22 companies and 97 plants, however, as neither cement's contribution to total profits nor to total sales could be determined from the other financial data available. This analysis indicated that all but four companies could meet the costs of instituting pollution controls in all of their plants without difficulty, often from internal funds generated just in 1972. Three of these companies are presently engaged in extensive modernization programs that may include installation of pollution controls, although no specific details were provided in the sources consulted. The fourth has elected to purchase cement from Mexico and other sources rather than to increase productive capacity.

---

1. Ibid.

The cost of installing pollution control equipment might justify price increases of from 1 percent to 3 percent per ton in polluting plants. There are, however, almost as many nonpolluting plants in the cement industry as plants that discharge pollutants. Competitive pressures from nonpolluting plants located in close proximity to polluting plants and selling in approximately the same market areas may serve to restrain polluting plants from recovering pollution control costs through cement price increases.

Plant closings, and resulting unemployment in affected areas, are more likely to result from a decrease in cement consumption than from pollution control requirements. The number of cement plants has been declining for many years, but the only plant known to have been abandoned in 1973 was a nonpolluting plant. Communities, therefore, will benefit from clean water, rather than experience employment losses due to production curtailments.

U. S. imports of cement (white, clinker, and gray) in 1972 were about $71 million. U. S. exports of cement were about $4 million. This represented an increase in imports and a decrease in exports over previous years but is still insignificant in terms of our balance of payments situation. Domestic shortages of cement, generally in localized areas, are more likely to contribute to shifts in international trade in cement than pollution controls.

Although complete or partial water discharge data are available for 120 of the 164 plants in the cement industry, this study is limited by a lack of data on the polluting practices of 44 nonleaching plants. These 44 plants are estimated to account for approximately 20 percent of total cement production and capacity but none has applied for a RAPP application. Moreover, many of these plants are owned by one or two plant companies for which financial data are also lacking. An investigation into the polluting status of these 44 plants appears to be warranted.

II. INDUSTRY SEGMENTS

A. Types of Plants as Affected by Pollution Control Requirements

The economic impact of water pollution control requirements on the cement industry can be determined most practically by segmenting the industry on the extent to which pollution controls will be required in plants by 1977 and 1983. As indicated in the report, Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance,[1] submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in August, 1973, pollution control standards are based on achieving essentially pollutant-free effluent discharges by 1977 or 1983, depending on the availability of technologies to achieve this goal. Cement plants have been categorized as leaching or nonleaching plants because the extent to which plants rely on kiln-dust leaching systems determines the type and quantity of pollutants discharged, as well as the extent to which pollution control standards can be met by 1977 or 1983.

Cement plants can achieve essentially pollutant-free discharges by:

1. Discharging less than 0.01 lb/ton of suspended solids, or 0.01 lb/ton of dissolved solids, with the total not to exceed 0.01 lb/ton of clinker or cement.

2. Limiting thermal pollution so as not to exceed a 3°C increase in stream temperature.

3. Containment or neutralization of coal- and dust-pile runoffs.

4. Limiting the pH of discharged water to within a 6.0 to 9.0 range.

The technology for achieving these standards by 1977 is currently available for all nonleaching plants, or plants that do not recover kiln dust by leaching systems. According to RAPP applications and Southern Research Institute questionnaire responses, 56 nonleaching plants have already met these requirements. No technology has as yet been specifically designed to reduce the discharges of dissolved solids from the leaching systems of cement plants that practice kiln-dust recovery. Leaching plants, therefore,

---

1. Ibid.

have until 1983 to limit discharges of suspended and dissolved solids to 0.1 lb/ton and until 1977 to limit discharges of suspended solids to 0.8 lb/ton and to meet the same requirements as non-leaching plants for reducing thermal, dust, and pH pollution to acceptable levels. Of the nine reported active plants with leaching systems, seven have met the 1977 standards for reduction of suspended solids, but six of these will require some additional pollution controls to meet all the 1977 requirements. By 1983, all nine plants with leaching systems will be required to achieve the same essentially pollutant-free status required of nonleaching plants by 1977.

A major factor in determining the economic impact of pollution controls on the cement industry is the cost, both capital and annual, of implementing these standards. All cement plants will be affected by pollution control requirements to some extent, but the type of plant most severely affected will be the type that leaches. The costs of implementing pollution controls are directly related to the type and quantity of pollutants discharged, and leachate systems not only generate the greatest quantity of solid pollutants but the pollutants discharged tend to be least amenable to control at the present time.

An analysis of the variety of pollutants discharged by each of the 120 producing plants for which data were available is presented in Table 1. The alternative technologies to control these pollutants are described in Table 2. The data indicate that 56 of the 111 reported nonleaching plants currently meet 1977 control standards and will require no further investment for pollution control systems. The 55 polluting nonleaching plants will each have an estimated capital expenditure of $300,000 for the installation of either the so-called A or B pollution control systems described in Table 2. Estimated annual operating costs for Alternative A are $97,000, as compared with $79,000 for Alternative B. Thermal pollution, however, can only be treated through Alternative A and only the 22 nonleaching plants without thermal pollution problems can select either alternative. Because the control system selected by any one plant will depend on its existing equipment and local conditions, for which data are not available, it has been assumed in this study that all nonleaching polluting plants will choose Alternative A. The costs for installing the B pollution control technology have consequently been disregarded in the remainder of this report. The total initial cost of installing pollution controls in the 55 nonleaching plants with pollutant discharges is, therefore, estimated at $16,500,000.

have until 1983 to limit discharges of suspended and dissolved solids to 0.1 lb/ton and until 1977 to limit discharges of suspended solids to 0.8 lb/ton and to meet the same requirements as non-leaching plants for reducing thermal, dust, and pH pollution to acceptable levels. Of the nine reported active plants with leaching systems, seven have met the 1977 standards for reduction of suspended solids, but six of these will require some additional pollution controls to meet all the 1977 requirements. By 1983, all nine plants with leaching systems will be required to achieve the same essentially pollutant-free status required of nonleaching plants by 1977.

A major factor in determining the economic impact of pollution controls on the cement industry is the cost, both capital and annual, of implementing these standards. All cement plants will be affected by pollution control requirements to some extent, but the type of plant most severely affected will be the type that leaches. The costs of implementing pollution controls are directly related to the type and quantity of pollutants discharged, and leachate systems not only generate the greatest quantity of solid pollutants but the pollutants discharged tend to be least amenable to control at the present time.

An analysis of the variety of pollutants discharged by each of the 120 producing plants for which data were available is presented in Table 1. The alternative technologies to control these pollutants are described in Table 2. The data indicate that 56 of the 111 reported nonleaching plants currently meet 1977 control standards and will require no further investment for pollution control systems. The 55 polluting nonleaching plants will each have an estimated capital expenditure of $300,000 for the installation of either the so-called A or B pollution control systems described in Table 2. Estimated annual operating costs for Alternative A are $97,000, as compared with $79,000 for Alternative B. Thermal pollution, however, can only be treated through Alternative A and only the 22 nonleaching plants without thermal pollution problems can select either alternative. Because the control system selected by any one plant will depend on its existing equipment and local conditions, for which data are not available, it has been assumed in this study that all nonleaching polluting plants will choose Alternative A. The costs for installing the B pollution control technology have consequently been disregarded in the remainder of this report. The total initial cost of installing pollution controls in the 55 nonleaching plants with pollutant discharges is, therefore, estimated at $16,500,000.

Table 1
Number of Cement Plants by Information Source, Manufacturing Process, Alternative Pollution Control Systems, and Type of Pollution[a]

	Total	Information source: RAPP applications	Information source: SRI survey	Manufacturing process: Wet	Manufacturing process: Dry	Alternative pollution control systems
Number of plants, total	120	85	35	78	42	
Nonleaching plants, total	111	79	34	71	40	
Currently meeting 1977 pollution control standards for nonleaching plants	56	23	33	33	23	X
By types of pollution:						
Total solids of 0.01 lb/ton or over (solids)	16	16	0	11	5	A or B
Thermal rise of more than 3°C (thermal)	12	11	1	6	6	A
Dust pile runoff (dust)	0	0	0	0	0	H
pH within range of 6.0 to 9.0 (pH)	0	0	0	0	0	H
Solids and thermal	13	13	0	11	2	A
Solids, thermal, and dust	1	1	0	0	1	A
Solids, thermal, and pH	4	4	0	3	1	A
Solids, thermal, dust, and pH	2	2	0	1	1	A
Solids and dust	1	1	0	1	0	A or B
Solids and pH	3	3	0	2	1	A or B
Solids, dust, and pH	2	2	0	2	0	A or B
Thermal, dust, and pH	1	1	0	1	0	A
Total	55	54	1	38	17	
Leaching plants, total	9	8	1	7	2	
Currently meeting 1977 and 1983 standards for suspended solids, but required to reduce dissolved solids to 0.005 lb/ton by 1983	1	1	0	1	0	D(1983) or E
Currently meeting 1977 standards for suspended solids but required to further reduce suspended and to reduce dissolved solids to a total of 0.01 lb/ton by 1983	2	2	0	2	0	CD(1983) or E
By types of pollution:[b]						
Suspended solids of 0.80 lb/ton or over by 1977 and total of 0.01 lb/ton of suspended and dissolved solids by 1983 (total solids)	2	1	1	1	1	C(1977) D(1983) or E
Thermal rise of more than 3°C by 1977 and total solids by 1983	3	3	0	3	0	CA(1977) CD(1983) or E C
pH over 9.0 by 1977 and total solids by 1983	1	1	0	0	1	CH(1977) CD(1983) or E
Total	9	8	1	7	2	

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. Leaching plants have until 1983 to achieve the essentially pollutant-free status required of nonleaching plants by 1977. Pollution control standards for 1977 allow leaching plants to discharge 0.80 lb/ton of suspended solids and set no limitations on dissolved solid pollutants because the technology is not currently available for their control. Thermal, dust, and pH pollution must be controlled by all cement plants by 1977, however, as the technology is currently available and in use.

Table 2
Alternative Pollution Control Systems for Achieving Essentially No Discharge of Pollutants by Cement Plants in 1977 or 1983[a]

Pollution control systems		Year	Number of plants
	Nonleaching plants	1973	111[b]
X	Currently meeting 1977 and 1983 pollution control standards	1973	56
A	Requiring installation of cooling tower or spray pond for control of total solids, thermal and pH pollution, and containment or neutralization of dust-pile runoff	1977	55
B	Requiring isolation of cooling streams and limited reuse of cooling and miscellaneous wastewater for control of total solids, pH, and containment or neutralization of dust-pile runoff	1977	22
	Leaching plants	1973	9[b]
D	Currently meeting 1977 standards for leaching plants, but requiring electrodialysis or other technique to reduce dissolved solids and recycle leachate stream by 1983	1983	1
CD	Currently meeting 1977 standards for leaching plants but requiring further reduction of suspended solids (Alternative C) plus Alternative D by 1983	CD-1983	2
C and D	Requiring installation of cooling tower or spray pond, plus neutralization and reuse of cooling and miscellaneous water, neutralization and settling of leachate for control of suspended solids, and thermal and pH pollution, and containment or neutralization of dust-pile runoff by 1977 plus Alternative D in 1983	C-1977 D-1983	2
CA and CD	Requiring installation of cooling tower or spray pond for control of thermal pollution by 1977 plus balance of Alternative C plus Alternative D by 1983.	CA-1977 CD-1983	3
CH and CD	Requiring treatment of pH in effluent discharges by 1977 plus balance of Alternative C plus Alternative D by 1983	CH-1977 CD-1983	1
E	Electing to abandon leaching systems	1977 or 1983	9

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. The sum of individual plants exceeds the total number of plants in each category because some plants are classified under more than one alternative pollution control system.

Cement plants with leachate systems may be considered as consisting of two separate operations, one involved in the production of cement and the other in the recycling of collected kiln dusts. The cement manufacturing facilities of these plants are similar to those of nonleaching plants, but the leaching operation generates far greater quantities of pollutants than does the direct production process. Pollution control standards for leaching plants in 1977 are less stringent than for nonleaching plants, as the maximum limit for suspended solids is set at 0.80 lb/ton of cement. Reduction of suspended and dissolved solids to 0.01 lb/ton, with the total not to exceed 0.01 lb/ton, will not be required of leaching plants until 1983.

Three of these leaching-system plants will require no expenditures for pollution control until 1983, by which year two plants will be required to install Alternatives C and D, at an estimated cost of $760,000 per plant for the control of suspended and dissolved solids and one will require only Alternative D, at an estimated cost of $240,000, for the control of dissolved solids. Two plants will require the complete installation of the Alternative C system by 1977 to meet 1977 standards for suspended solids, at an estimated cost of $540,000 per plant, and have until 1983 to install the Alternative D controls for dissolved solids.

The Alternative C control system is basically the A technology involving the installation of a cooling tower or spray pond for recycling and reuse of cooling and miscellaneous water, plus a neutralization and settling process for the leachate discharges. Three leaching plants will be required to install the equivalent of Alternative A controls by 1977 to limit thermal pollution at an estimated cost of $300,000 per plant. By 1983, these three plants will have to complete the installation of the Alternative C system (at $220,000 per plant) for control of suspended solids as well as the Alternative D system (at $240,000 per plant) for the control of dissolved solids. One leaching plant need only treat its effluent discharges with acid to reduce excessive pH, at a cost of $15,000, to meet 1977 standards for leaching plants, and can defer the installation of the balance of the C Alternative to 1983, at which time D Alternative system controls will also be required.

Thus, the total estimated cost for cement plants with leaching systems to meet pollution control standards has been estimated at $2 million by 1977 and $4 million by 1983. Annual operating costs are estimated at about $600,000 by 1977 and an additional $1.5 million by 1983. By 1983, eight of the nine leaching plants will, therefore, be required to invest about $760,000 and expend $245,000 annually per plant to achieve essentially pollutant-free discharges. One will require only Alternative D controls at $240,000 and annual expenditures of $98,500 for the reduction of dissolved solids.

The comparatively higher cost of controlling effluent discharges from leachate systems may induce some leaching plants to abandon the leaching process and maintain only their cement manufacturing operations. Those plants that choose this alternative, listed as Alternative E in Table 2, will be required to meet the 1977 pollution control standards for nonleaching plants, but will require no additional investment in 1983, or until such time as they may again decide to recover kiln dust by leaching.

The total investment for achieving essentially pollutant-free effluent discharges in the cement industry by 1983 is estimated at $23 million. As indicated above, these costs are directly related to the type and quantity of pollutants discharged by the two major categories of cement plants, those that leach and those that do not.

1. Types of firms

The cement industry consisted of 50 companies with 170 plants dispersed throughout 41 states and Puerto Rico in 1972, according to the Bureau of Mines,[1] but only 169 plants were identified in this study (See Figure 1). Four of these were closed in 1972 and one was abandoned in 1973. The Bureau of Mines has estimated that total production reached 84.6 million short tons in 1972. Annual plant capacity was estimated at 85.8 million short tons and rated capacity utilization for the industry as a whole was about 92.2% in that year. Imports for consumption totaled 4.8 million short tons, an increase of 57% over the tonnages imported in 1971.

a. Size of firms

The 120 cement plants covered in this study represented 73.2% of the 164 plants identified as active in 1973. They produced an estimated 61.9 million short tons, or 73.1% of all cement produced, and accounted for 69.3 million short tons, or 80.7% of total capacity.[2] The 44 plants for which no data are available, except plant name, company, and location, therefore, represent approximately one-fourth of the total industry. The Bureau of Mines has estimated that 15 companies accounted for 67% of total cement production in 1972.[1] According to the data presented in Tables 3 and 4, 14 companies accounted for 62.8% of the total reported production, suggesting that the larger companies have been adequately represented by the 120 plants covered in this report. As also indicated in Table 3, however, the fewer the number of plants operated by a company, the fewer is the number of plants that company is likely

---

1. Commodity Data Summaries, Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, January, 1973.
2. Based on reported production in 1972 or 1973 of 184,815 tons/day at 120 plants operating approximately 335 days per year and Bureau of Mines estimates of total production and capacity in 1972.

Figure 1
Location of Cement Mills and Cement Distribution Terminals—May, 1972[a]



a. Prepared by Southern Research Institute from map published by the Portland Cement Association, Skokie, 1972.

Table 3
Nonleaching Cement Plants by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977[a]

Company	Plant identification: Location	Plant identification: Code	Current water treatment techniques	Nonleaching plants: Alternative X (RAPP permits or SRI survey suggest that no further controls are required to meet EPA standards for 1977 or 1983): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative X: Employees (number)	Alternative X: Production (tons/day)	Alternative A (cooling tower or spray pond and dust containment): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative A: Employees (number)	Alternative A: Production (tons/day)
Alpha Portland Industries, Inc.	4	101					340[b]	134[b]	900[b]
	3	102	WTF	430	110	1,220			
	6	103					470	130	1,030
	2	105		510	150	1,600			
	2	106					170[b]	77[b]	564[b]
	7	c							
Amcord, Inc.	3	201	R&R				660	160	1,690
	5[d]	204							
	9	205	R&R	490	136	1,597			
	9	206	R&R	960	300	3,000			
	9	207	R&R	1,220	265	3,500			
Arkansas Cement Corporation	6	c							
Ash Grove Cement Company	7	401	WTF				530[b]	150[b]	1,570[b]
	7	402					660	250	1,600
Atlantic Cement Company, Inc.	2	501	WTF/R&R				1,600[b]	300[b]	4,850[b]
California Portland Cement Company	9	1101	WTF				850[b]	321[b]	2,260[b]
	9	c							
	9	c							
Capital Aggregates, Inc.	6	c							
Centex Cement Corporation	6	c							
	9	c							
Century Cement Company	2[d]	c							
Columbia Cement Company	10	1503					360	114	1,030
	5	c							
	5	c							
Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co.	3	c							
	3	c							
Dundee Cement Company	7	c							
The Flintkote Company	9	2201	R&R	850	334	2,600			
	9	2202	R&R	280	92	900			
	5	2203	WTF/R&R	600	180	1,200			
	2	2204		340	150	960			
	4	2205		560	401	1,200			
General Portland, Inc.	4	2302	WTF				1,320	321	3,010
	5	2303					470[b]	175[b]	1,350[b]
	4	2304					380[b]		1,880[b]
	6	2305	WTF				660[b]		1,220[b]
	6	2306					750	160	2,140
	4	c							
	6	c							
	7	c							
	9	c							
Giant Portland Cement Company	4	2401		750	250	2,270			
Gifford-Hill & Company	6	c							
Gulf Coast Portland Cement Company	6	2601		750	65	1,200			
Hawaiian Cement Corporation	9	c							
Hudson Cement Company	2	c							

Table 3 (Cont'd)
Nonleaching Cement Plants by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977[a]

Company	Plant identification: Location	Plant identification: Code	Nonleaching plants: Current water treatment techniques	Nonleaching plants: Alternative X (RAPP permits or SRI survey suggest that no further controls are required to meet EPA standards for 1977 or 1983): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative X: Employees (number)	Alternative X: Production (tons/day)	Alternative A (cooling tower or spray pond and dust containment): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative A: Employees (number)	Alternative A: Production (tons/day)
Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.	6	3202	WTF				360[b]	133[b]	762[b]
	8	3205	R&R				410	150	1,178
	6	3207					560	162	970
	8	3208					280[b]	126[b]	738[b]
	7	3209		380	135	563			
	6	3210	R&R	660	101	846			
	4	3211					660[b]	168[b]	1,384[b]
	6	3213		660	143	1,129			
	8	3214					360	131	805
	4	3215					530	164	1,005
	8	c							
	9[d]	c							
	10	c							
Kaiser Cement and Gypsum Corporation	9	3301	WTF				1,600	520	4,700
	8	3304	WTF/R&R				260	81	980
	6	3305					510	138	1,200
	9	c							
	9	c							
Keystone Portland Cement Company	3	c							
Lehigh Portland Cement Company	3	4101		920	173	2,620			
	2	4102	WTF				510	125	1,090
	4	4103		510	120	1,360			
	5	4104	WTF				470	125	1,420
	7	4105					620	170	1,820
	10	c							
Lone Star Industries, Inc.	4	4202	R&R				280[b]	110[b]	700[b]
	5	4203	WTF	750	148	2,375			
	7	4204	R&R				450	155	1,145
	6	4205	R&R	550	128	1,545			
	3	4206	R&R	680	223	1,700			
	3	4207	R&R	640	197	1,700			
	4	4208	R&R				360[b]	141[b]	705[b]
	6	4209		410	225	1,540			
	10	4210		240	116	1,175			
	9	4211	WTF/R&R	560	256	1,200			
	6	4213	WTF/R&R				620	160[b]	1,300[b]
Louisville Cement Company	3	4303	WTF				880	300	1,970
	5	c							
	5	c							
Marquette Cement Manufacturing Company	4	5101		240	82	850			
	5	5102		750	c	2,080			
	2	5103	R&R				620	125	1,700
	4	5104	R&R	190	c	440			
	7	5105		410	165	1,166			
	7[d]	5107							
	4	5108	WTF/R&R				230	75	627
	3	5109		410	c	1,290			
	3	5110		380	c	1,150			
	4	5111					240	c	670
	5	5112					240	85	750
Martin Marietta Corporation	5	5201		190	c	1,850			
	3	5202	R&R	900	295	2,700			
	7	5203	R&R				640	200	1,650
	6	5204	R&R	640	c	1,900			
	1	5205					470[b]	210[b]	1,250[b]
	8	5206	R&R	430	115	1,300			
	4	5207	WTR/R&R				550	c	1,640
	4	5208	R&R	560	80	1,875			
	3	5209		450	c	1,150			
Maule Industries	4	c							
Medusa Corporation	3	5801					770	112	2,000
	5	5803	WTF/R&R				660	c	1,650
	3	5804					490	190	1,820
	5	5805	WTF/R&R				750	90	2,100
	4	c							
	5	c							
	5	c							

Table 3 (Cont'd)
Nonleaching Cement Plants by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977[a]

Company	Plant identification: Location	Plant identification: Code	Nonleaching plants: Current water treatment techniques	Nonleaching plants: Alternative X (RAPP permits or SRI survey suggest that no further controls are required to meet EPA standards for 1977 or 1983): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative X: Employees (number)	Alternative X: Production (tons/day)	Alternative A (cooling tower or spray pond and dust containment): Capacity (1000 short tons)	Alternative A: Employees (number)	Alternative A: Production (tons/day)
Mississippi Valley Cement Industries, Inc.	4	5401	R&R				230	53	600
Missouri Portland Cement Company	5	5503	WTF/R&R	560	79	1,700			
Monarch Cement Company	7	5601	WTF	450	165	1,130			
Monolith Portland Cement Company	8	c							
	9	c							
National Cement Company	4	6101	WTF	380	160	1,128			
National Gypsum Company	5	6201					2,440	970	6,670
	3	6202					940	130	2,760
Northwestern States Portland Cement Company	7	c							
OKC Corporation	6	7102					320[b]	60[b]	1,020[b]
	6	c							
Oregon Portland Cement Company	10	7201					190	55	300
	10	7202					790	c	830
	10	7203		380	90	380			
Penn-Dixie Cement Corporation	5	7305	WTF	660	167	1,880			
	2	c							
	3	c							
	3	c							
	4	c							
	7	c							
Portland Cement Company of Utah	8	c							
Puerto Rican Cement Company, Inc.	2	7501	R&R				1,600[b]	400[b]	3,760[b]
	2	7502					560	400[b]	1,880[b]
River Cement Company	7	c							
San Antonio Portland Cement Company	6	c							
San Juan Cement Company	2	8301	WTF/R&R	380	250	1,320			
Santee Portland Cement Company	4	8401	WTF/R&R	380	100	1,130			
South Dakota Cement Plant	8	8501	WTF				450	150	1,500
Southwestern Portland Cement Company	9	8601	R&R	1,410	405	2,440			
	5	8602	R&R	620	272	1,550			
	6	8603	R&R	340	175	800			
	6	8604	R&R	230	66	685			
	6	8605	R&R	230	59	580			
Texas Industries	6	c							
Universal Atlas Cement Division U.S. Steel Corporation	2	9201	R&R				750	280	900
	3	9202	WTF/R&R	550	270	1,280			
	3	9203	R&R	510	c	1,200			
	5	9204	WTF/R&R	470	c	1,200			
	5	9205		429	c	1,300			
	5	9206	R&R	320	c	875			
	7	9207	R&R	680	180	1,800			
	7	9208					390[b]	150[b]	1,180[b]
	4	9209	R&R	340	c	880			
	6	9210	R&R				390[b]	170[b]	1,200[b]
Whitehall Cement Manufacturing Company	3	9301		550	200	1,690			

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. Nonleaching plants with no discharge of thermal pollutants that can achieve total pollution control through either Alternative A or B.

c. No data available.

d. Closed.

WTF Wastewater treatment facility.

R&R Recycling and reuse of water.

Table 4
Cement Plants with Leachate Streams by Company, Capacity, Employment, Production, and Required Pollution Controls by 1977 and 1983[a]

Company	Location	Code	Capacity (1000 short tons)	Employees (number)	Production (tons/day)	Alternative pollution control systems	
						1977	1983
Amcord, Inc.	5	202		(closed)			
	5	203	770	70	2,060	CA	CD
Dundee Cement Company	5	2101	1,130	220	3,000	-	CD
Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.	4	3201	530	158	1,308	C	D
	6	3206	710	155	1,909	CA	CD
Marquette Cement Manufacturing Company	5	5106	240	n.a.	696	C	D
Missouri Portland Cement Company	7	5501	940	200	2,850	-	D
	7	5502	560	147	1,800	CH	CD
National Portland Cement Company	3	6301	380	180	1,130	CA	CD
Penn-Dixie Cement Corporation	4	7303	300	123	940	-	CD

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire response, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

to have had included in the 120-plant survey. No plant data are available for three companies with two plants each and 12 one-plant companies. Thus, it should be noted that the 35 companies with 120 plants for which data were reported are more representative of the larger companies than of the smaller firms in the cement industry.

When cement companies are grouped by size, or by number of plants reported, as in Table 5, the data suggest that pollution practices may be related to size of company, particularly companies with nonleaching plants. The 110 nonleaching plants for which data are available, as pointed out earlier, are almost equally divided between polluting and nonpolluting plants, with 56 plants currently meeting pollution control standards and with 55 to be required to control pollutant discharges. Companies with either one plant or with four to seven plants also have approximately the same total number of polluting and nonpolluting plants. Companies with either two or three plants, however, appear to have a marked preponderance of polluting plants. Although the data suggest that the largest cement companies may have been more active than smaller companies in limiting pollutant discharges in their nonleaching plants, the evidence is inconclusive because smaller companies are, as noted above, inadequately represented in the 120-plant survey. The operation of cement plants with leachate streams does not appear to be related to size of company, as measured by number of plants.

As indicated in Table 5, the 16 companies with data available for one plant each account for 46% of the companies and 13% of the plants. Seven companies with two or three plants reported account for 20% of the companies and 14% of the plants, and the seven companies with four to seven plants reported also account for 20% of the companies, but for 28% of the plants. The five largest companies, with nine or more plants reported for each, account for 14% of the companies and 44% of the plants, or almost a complete reversal of the role of the smallest companies. Companies with two or three plants, however, appear to have a greater share and companies with nine or more plants a lesser share of total capacity, employment, and production than is consistent with their share of total plants. The similarities between these groups of companies, whether measured by polluting practices or size of plants, suggests that further investigation might be warranted to determine if a relationship does in fact exist between the size of a company and the need for water pollution controls.

b. Level of integration

Cement companies generally quarry their own limestone and other raw materials and, thus, are integrated as far backward as possible. Forward integration has also advanced rapidly to the production of concrete by most smaller firms, and to construction and to retail outlets for cement and concrete by the larger companies. It is difficult to separate integration from diversification for

Table 5
Cement Plants by Size of Company, Capacity, Employment, and Production, Segmented by Required Pollution Controls[a]

Companies by total number of plants	Companies by number of plants reviewed		Pollution controls required							
			Total plants reviewed		Nonleaching plants				Leaching plants	
					X		A		C, CA, CH(1977)	CD, D(1983)
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Number
1	16	45.7	16	13.3	7	5.8	7	5.8	1	1
2 or 3	7	20.0	17	14.2	3	2.5	11	9.2	1	2
4 to 7	7	20.0	34	28.3	17	14.2	16	13.3	1	-
9 to 14	5	14.3	53	44.2	29	24.2	21	17.5	3	-
Total	35	100.0	120	100.0	56	46.7	55	45.8	6	3

Capacity (thousand short tons)

Companies by total number of plants	Total		Nonleaching plants				Leaching plants			
			X		A		C, CA, CH(1977)		CD, D(1983)	
	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total
1	9,840	14.2	3,640	5.3	4,690	6.8	380	0.5	1,130	1.6
2 or 3	13,480	19.4	1,600	2.3	10,080	14.5	560	0.8	1,240	1.8
4 to 7	20,760	29.9	10,500	15.1	9,490	13.7	770	1.1	-	-
9 to 14	25,249	36.4	14,379	20.7	9,390	13.5	1,480	2.1	-	-
Total	69,329	100.0	30,119	43.4	33,650	48.5	3,190	4.6	2,370	3.4

Employment[b] (number)

Companies by total number of plants	Total		Nonleaching plants				Leaching plants			
			X		A		C, CA, CH(1977)		CD, D(1983)	
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
1	2,888	15.6	1,190	6.4	1,298	7.0	180	1.0	220	1.2
2 or 3	3,900	21.1	336	1.8	3,094	16.7	147	0.8	323	1.7
4 to 7	5,650	30.5	3,388	18.3	2,192	11.8	70	0.4	-	-
9 to 14	6,067	32.8	2,859	15.5	2,895	15.6	313	1.7	-	-
Total	18,505	100.0	7,773	42.0	9,479	51.2	710	3.8	543	2.9

Production (tons/day)

Companies by total number of plants	Total		Nonleaching plants				Leaching plants			
			X		A		C, CA, CH(1977)		CD, D(1983)	
	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total	Short tons	Percent of total
1	27,228	14.7	9,868	5.3	13,230	7.2	1,130	0.6	3,000	1.6
2 or 3	35,800	19.4	3,960	2.1	26,250	14.2	1,800	1.0	3,790	2.0
4 to 7	55,556	30.1	27,812	15.1	25,684	13.9	2,060	1.1	-	-
9 to 14	66,231	35.8	40,059	21.7	22,259	12.0	3,913	2.1	-	-
Total	184,815	100.0	81,699	44.2	87,423	47.3	8,903	4.8	6,790	3.7

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. Excludes 17 plants for which no employment data were reported.

cement companies, as the smaller companies are as likely to be absorbed by concrete producers as they are likely to produce concrete. Only one of the companies with five or more plants produces cement exclusively and, as indicated in Table 6, the primary product produced by cement companies with from one to three plants was as likely to be concrete as cement.

c. Number of plants

Cement companies, as noted earlier, each currently operate from one to 14 plants. The 35 companies and 120 plants for which data were reported include five companies with nine to 12 plants, accounting for 44% of the total; seven companies with four to seven plants, or 28% of the total; seven companies with two or three plants, or 14% of the total; and 16 companies with one plant each that account for 13% of the total number of plants. Data on individual companies by number of plants and types of pollution control systems required by 1977 or 1983 were presented in Table 5, above.

d. Number of products

Cement plants generally produce only one product—hydraulic cement, and the specialization ratio for the cement industry is about 99%. The basic cement types classified by the Bureau of Mines and the Department of Commerce are portland, masonry, slag, pozzolan, and aluminous cement. Approximately 92% of total production consists of portland cement. Portland cement categories include normal portland, white, sulfate resisting, and high-early strength cement.

e. Level of diversification

Companies in the cement industry are highly diversified, particularly the fourteen companies with five or more plants. Only one of these fourteen companies produces only cement. The others are divisions or subsidiaries of firms whose activities range, as indicated in Table 6, from the manufacture of concrete, furniture, and tufted rugs to retail and wholesale outlets and to engineering, construction, land development, and holding companies. Companies with one to three cement plants rarely diversify beyond concrete manufacturing, and most of the companies that do integrate forward are divisions or subsidiaries of other companies or conglomerates.

2. Types of plants

Cement plants produce one basic product by either a wet or dry process. Despite numerous variations in the application of these processes to cement manufacture, the only significant difference between plants is whether collected kiln dust is reused or wasted and, if reused, whether it is returned to the kiln

Table 6
Cement Companies by Sales and Other Activities[a]

Company	Number of active plants	Estimated sales of cement, 1972 (in millions of dollars)	Companies listing cement as their primary industry	Companies not listing cement as a major product	Companies that are divisions or subsidiaries	Other company activities
Ideal	14	175	x		Div	Concrete, aggregates, potash
Marquette	11	104	x			
Lone Star	11	148		x	Div	Concrete, furniture, carpets, construction, retail building, rugs, ore processes, commercial development
Universal-Atlas	10	n.a.		x	Div	Steel production
General	9	116	x			Retail furniture, real estate development
Martin Marietta	9	115		x	Div	Aerospace, construction materials
Medusa	7	81	x			Heavy engineering
Penn-Dixie	7	55	x			Chemicals, holding company
Alpha	6	36		x		Construction, holding company, recreation products
Lehigh	6	108[c]	x			Concrete, furniture, carpeting
Amcord	5	106	x			Holding company
Flintkote	5	40			Group	Concrete, paperboard, gypsum, and asbestos
Kaiser	5	83	x		Sub	Manufacturing and wholesale - gypsum insulating products
Southwestern	5	56	x		Sub	Beverages, sugar, oil, and gas
California	3	72[b]	x			Concrete, oil and gas exploration
Columbia	3	n.a.			Div	
Louisville	3	44	x			
Missouri	3	31	x			Concrete, machine gears
Oregon	3	13	x			Lime, agricultural products
Ash Grove	2	n.a.	x			Lime
Centex	2	259[b]		x		Building contractors, holding company
Coplay	2	17	x			
Dundee	2	n.a.				
Monolith	2	12	x		Sub	
National Gypsum	2	78		x		Gypsum, wall covering, mobile homes, building supplies
OKC	2	16	x			Crude oil refining, real estate, ore and gas exploration
Puerto Rican	2	36	x			Lime, bags, sugar processing
Arkansas	1	19		x	Sub	Retail building products
Atlantic	1	40	x			Concrete
Capitol	1	12	x		Sub	Concrete, petroleum storage - warehousing, trucking
Giant	1	18	x			
Gifford-Hill	1	5	x		Sub	Concrete aggregates, transportation, pipe
Gulf Coast	1	n.a.			Div	
Hawaiian	1	65[b]	x			
Hudson	1	n.a.				
Keystone	1	14	x			Concrete, furniture, carpets, and rugs
Maule	1	32[b]		x	Sub	Concrete, lumber, and building materials
Mississippi Valley	1	3	x			
Monarch	1	6	x			
National Cement	1	n.a.			Div	
National Portland	1	n.a.				
Northwestern	1	n.a.				
Portland	1	5	x			
River	1	36[b]	x		Sub	Concrete, oil and gas drilling
San Antonio	1	5	x			
San Juan	1	n.a.				
Santee	1	10	x			
South Dakota	1	6	x			
Texas	1	88[b]		x	Sub	Concrete, sand and gravel, stone and stone products
Whitehall	1	12	x			

a. Dun and Bradstreets Million Dollar Directory, Dun and Bradstreet, Inc., New York, 1973, and annual reports of cement companies.

b. Sales of cement have been included in total company sales.

c. Cement sales include sales of other construction materials.

directly or leached. Dust recovery is not essential to cement manufacture, except to the degree that recovery and reuse affect costs and profitability. Typical cement plant processes were described in the aforementioned report on effluent limitation guidelines.[1]

The 120 plants covered in this report have been segmented by pollution control categories, as well as by location, size (capacity and production), age, employment, and productivity levels as measured in tons of cement produced per man/day. The average leaching plant has greater capacity, produces more cement, employs fewer workers, and has a higher productivity level than the average nonleaching plant. As indicated below, however, there are marked differences between leaching plants that will require pollution controls by 1977, and those that have until 1983 to reduce their pollutant discharges. Within the nonleaching plant categories, the average polluting plant appears to be larger and more productive than the average nonpolluting plant.

a. Size of plants

Data on the size of plants, by location and pollution control categories, are presented in Tables 7 and 8. Table 7 describes cement plants in terms of capacity and Table 8 in terms of production of cement in tons/day. Regardless of the measure used, the data indicate that nonleaching plants requiring Alternative A pollution controls tend to be larger than nonleaching plants requiring no additional controls (Category X). For nonleaching plants, therefore, the data suggest a possible relationship between size and polluting practices. Data for plants with leaching systems, however, appear to suggest the opposite, as plants with the most serious polluting problems, or leaching plants in Category C, are well below average size in both capacity and production. Size of plant, therefore, does not appear to bear a significant relationship to polluting practices in leaching plants.

b. Age of plants

The age of cement plants also appears to be unrelated to size, location, or pollution status, but may be related to efficiency at the extremes of age. For example, plants ten years old or less appear to have higher productivity levels, and plants fifty years old or more to have lower productivity levels, than the average for all plants surveyed. Age, however, does not appear to be related to efficiency for plants more than ten but less than fifty years old.

---

1. Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, report prepared by Southern Research Institute, Birmingham, June 21, 1973 (revised).

Table 7
Cement Plants by Location, Capacity, and Pollution Control Categories[a]
(in number of plants and thousands of tons)

EPA District	Total plants (number)	Total capacity	Average capacity by district	Pollution control categories: Nonleaching plants: X: No. of plants	X: Annual capacity	Nonleaching plants: A: No. of plants	A: Annual capacity	Leaching plants: C, CA, CH(1977): No. of plants	C, CA, CH(1977): Annual capacity	Leaching plants: CD, D(1983): No. of plants	CD, D(1983): Annual capacity
I	1	470	470			1	470				
II	10	7,040	704	3	1,230	7	5,810				
III	17	10,540	620	11	6,420	5	3,740	1	380		
IV	22	9,860	448	9	3,910	11	5,120	1	530	1	300
V	19	12,519	659	10	5,349	6	5,030	2	1,010	1	1,130
VI	19	9,820	517	9	4,470	9	4,640	1	710		
VII	12	6,710	559	4	1,920	6	3,290	1	560	1	940
VIII	6	2,190	365	1	430	5	1,760				
IX	9	8,220	913	7	5,770	2	2,450				
X	5	1,960	392	2	620	3	1,340				
Total	120	69,329		56	30,119	55	33,650	6	3,190	3	2,370
Average capacity per plant		578			538		612		532		790

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

Table 8
Cement Plants by Location, Production in Tons/Day, and Pollution Control Categories[a]

EPA district	Total plants, (number)	Estimated total production	Average daily production per plant	Pollution control categories: Nonleaching plants: X: No. of plants	X: Production	Nonleaching plants: A: No. of plants	A: Production	Leaching plants: C, CA, CH(1977): No. of plants	C, CA, CH(1977): Production	Leaching plants: CD, D(1983): No. of plants	CD, D(1983): Production
I	1	1,250	1,250			1	1,250				
II	10	18,624	1,862	3	3,880	7	14,744				
III	17	29,070	1,710	11	17,700	5	10,240	1	1,130		
IV	22	26,502	1,205	9	11,133	11	13,121	1	1,308	1	940
V	19	35,706	1,879	10	16,010	6	13,940	2	2,756	1	3,000
VI	19	22,976	1,209	9	10,225	9	10,842	1	1,909		
VII	12	18,274	1,523	4	4,659	6	8,965	1	1,800	1	2,850
VIII	6	6,501	1,084	1	1,300	5	5,201				
IX	9	22,197	2,466	7	15,237	2	6,960				
X	5	3,715	743	2	1,555	3	2,160	-	-	-	-
Total	120	184,815		56	81,699	55	87,423	6	8,903	3	6,790
Average daily production per plant			1,540		1,459		1,590		1,484		2,263

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

Cement plants vary in age from new to 96 years. Of the 120 plants reviewed, 23 are no more than 10 years old; 26 are 11 to 25 years old; 28 are 26 to 50 years old, and 42 are at least 50 years old. The 56 nonpolluting plants include 11 plants no more than 10 years old, 16 plants from 11 to 25 years old, 11 plants 26 to 50 years old, and 18 plants 50 years old or more. Thus, nonpolluting plants account for slightly less than half of each group, just as they account for slightly less than half of all cement plants. The five newest plants in the industry, all operating for less than five years, are located in five different districts, have annual capacities ranging from 0.4 to 0.8 million short tons of cement and produce from 5.3 to 29.3 tons per worker daily. Two of these plants are nonleaching plants requiring no additional controls, two are nonleaching plants requiring A controls, and one is a leaching plant requiring C controls. Age of plant, therefore, does not appear to be significant in polluting practices.

c. Location

Approximately half of all cement produced in this country came from six states in 1972, each representing a different EPA region: California (IX), Pennsylvania (III), Texas (VI), Michigan (V), New York (I), and Missouri (VIII). Approximately 11% of total production was produced in California alone.

Of the 120 plants for which data are available, those 56 whose current discharges apparently already meet pollution control standards may generally be characterized as being widely dispersed throughout the United States, as indicated by the letter X in Figure 2. For the most part, these plants are within 300 miles of the more important regional (metropolitan) markets in the nation. A moderate concentration of 11 plants may be found in the Maryland-Philadelphia-Hudson River Valley region.

The 55 nonleaching plants that will require installation of a cooling tower or spray pond and containment of dust-pile runoff by 1977 are, as in the case of the nonpolluters, highly dispersed in the nation, too. These are characterized by the letter A. Many of these, with the exception of four or five in the Northwest, are within 300 miles of nonpolluters. The high-volume eastern half of the nation, especially, is marked by considerable mixing of the nonpolluters and the A-type plants.

Leaching plants are generally located near water transportation facilities in the eastern half of the nation. These nine plants are characterized by the letters C or D and are found within 200 miles of plants that apparently do not pollute.

Figure 2
Dispersion of Cement Plants by Water Pollution Status[a]


X No current water pollution
A Nonleaching, polluting plants (1977)
C Leaching plants (1977)
C, CA, CH Leaching plants with limited pollution (1977)
CH, D Leaching plants (1983)
II(P.R.) X,A,A

a. Prepared by Southern Research Institute from map published by the Portland Cement Association, Skokie, 1972.

Thus, most of the 67 plants in pollution categories A, C, and D, with relatively significant pollution problems are within competititive marketing reach of those with either no or relatively limited pollution problems. As a consequence, any tendency toward increased prices following from increases in costs required to curtail pollution may tend to be mitigated; any reductions in output that may ensue among so-called polluters should generally be matched by increases in output and sales of nearby nonpolluters.

d. Level of technology

The state of the art in cement making has been undergoing some change in recent years, with much of the impact visible in terms of efficiency, or increased output per worker, or relatively reduced costs per unit of output. Many improvements have been directed toward two major objectives, labor savings and, more recently, fuel and energy economy. The labor savings have often resulted in, or allowed, greater economies with increased scale of operations. The fuel and energy savings, as we understand the case, have not necessarily benefitted large-scale plants more than small-scale and small-scale plants may well have an edge in this matter at present.

The techniques of quarrying raw materials do not vary too much for most plants and have been improved primarily with the use of high-speed drills and large-capacity cranes and trucks. The mining of oyster shells does constitute a difference in technique. Oyster shells are normally dredged from lakes and bays, rather than excavated.

The transportation of raw materials to plant exhibits some differences among plants, depending upon location of the quarry and access to intervening types of transportation. Some transportation techniques are: hauling by truck, barge, or railroad car; and transport by conveyor belt or cable-drawn gondolas on tracks. The use of trucks, barges, and railroad cars has been affected by increases in container capacity and loading-unloading techniques, with opportunities for reductions in costs per unit of output. The conveyor belts and cable-drawn gondolas have also contributed to economies.

In crushing and grinding operations, techniques have undergone relatively little change, the major changes being in improved construction materials for reduced wear and down time and increased capacities for economies of scale.

Kilns constitute the most significant area of change in cement plants. Kilns have achieved increases in length and, to a lesser extent, diameter over the years, allowing for increases in capacity. They have also experienced modifications for reasons of fuel efficiency, as in the case of suspension preheaters in older, shorter kilns. This allows utilization of waste heat for significantly warming the raw mix before being fed to the kiln. Another change of this type has involved the use of new heat-exchange equipment within the kiln (new chain designs and materials and circular or radial heat exchangers). Kiln design has also been affected by changes in shapes and materials.

Finishing equipment (grinders and cement coolers) have changed relatively little, much of it in the same manner as crushing and grinding equipment used in preparing the raw materials.

Water management has improved through the use of lagoons, cooling towers, and ponds and efficient water management practices have increased over the years as the real cost of water has increased. Overall plant control and operations have tended to be improved with the use of electronic information and control systems.

Detailed information on these changes or improvements has not been tallied by plant or company. However, it is presupposed that the effects of the changes or improvements will be manifest largely in greater output per worker, or in lower relative average total costs per unit of output. In the case of fuel and energy, to the extent these costs have been rising, economies in fuel and energy consumption should tend to result in relatively stabilized average total costs per unit of output.

e. Efficiency

Efficiency of operation in cement plants, measured by production per man/day, has been computed for the 103 plants for which data on production in tons per day and number of production workers are available. These efficiency or productivity ratios, as indicated in Table 9, are the mean or average for each group of plants, segmented by EPA district and pollution control category.

Average cement production in 103 plants is approximately 8.9 tons per day per production worker. This productivity ratio is highest in EPA district V, where 16 nonleaching and 3 leaching plants are located, and lowest in District I, where only one nonleaching plant is located. Nonleaching plants requiring A pollution controls are only slightly more productive on average than nonpolluting, nonleaching plants, although their average size, as indicated in Tables 7 and 8, is considerably larger. Leaching plants in both pollution control categories are well above average in productivity ratios. It may be recalled that the six leaching

Table 9
Cement Plants by Location, Productivity Ratio Averages, and Pollution Control Categories[a]

EPA District	Total plants (number)	Average tons produced per man/day	Pollution control categories: Nonleaching plants: X: No. of plants	X: Average tons produced per man/day	A: No. of plants	A: Average tons produced per man/day	Leaching plants: C, CA, CH(1977): No. of plants	C, CA, CH(1977): Average tons produced per man/day	CD, D(1983): No. of plants	CD, D(1983): Average tons produced per man/day
I	1	6.0			1	6.0				
II	10	8.3	3	7.1	7	8.6				
III	13[b]	9.6	7[b]	8.8	5	11.5	1	6.3		
IV	18[b]	8.4	7[b]	8.2	9[b]	8.7	1	8.3	1	7.6
V	12[b]	10.1	5[b]	10.3	5[b]	8.5	1[b]	29.4	1	13.6
VI	18[b]	8.8	8[b]	8.7	9	8.6	1	12.3		
VII	12	8.8	4	7.2	6	8.3	1	12.2	1	14.3
VIII	6	8.6	1	11.3	5	8.2				
IX	9	8.4	7	8.5	2	8.3				
X	4[b]	7.7	2	7.6	2[b]	7.9	—	—	—	—
Total	103	8.9	44	8.5	51	8.7	5	11.6	3	12.5

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. The 17 plants for which employment data were not available include 12 plants in the X category, four in the A category, and one in the C category of pollution controls.

plants in the C category or those discharging pollutants that are capable of being controlled with available technology, were below the average for all cement plants in capacity and cement production, whereas the three leaching plants in the D category were well above average in size. The data suggest that productivity per worker may be independent of size of plant despite the trend toward larger kilns noted above. Leaching plants, for example, appear to achieve higher productivity per worker than nonleaching plants regardless of size.

The five plants with the highest productivity levels in the cement industry produce from 21.5 to 29.4 tons/day per production worker. These plants range from two to 46 years in age and have capacities of from 3.8 to 7.7 million short tons annually. Two of these plants are nonpolluting, nonleaching plants in the X category, two are nonleaching, polluting plants in the A category, and one leaching plant is in the C category of pollution controls.

f. Level of integration in production

Cement plants generally have their kilns and their grinding and recycling facilities on their own premises and most quarry their raw materials from nearby sites. As noted earlier, the production process tends to be similar in all plants, depending on whether the basic process is wet or dry, so that cement manufacturers do not vary to any great extent in the levels to which their production processes are integrated. Information on extent of production integration by pollution status was not directly available.

B. Number of Plants and Employees in Each Segment

Data on employment point up the differences between leaching and nonleaching plants, but do not appear to be related to the impact of pollution controls on the cement industry. As indicated in Table 10, there are 18,505 employees in the 103 plants for which employment data are available, or an average of 180 employees per plant. The C category of leaching plants is the only category that is significantly lower than the average for all plants.

C. Percent of Total Industry in Each Segment

The cement industry has been segmented into four pollution control categories. Of the 120 plants for which data were available, 56 plants are in the X category of plants currently meeting 1977 pollution control standards and three plants are in the D category of leaching plants currently meeting 1977 standards that have until 1983 to meet standards of "essentially no discharges of pollutants".

Table 10
Cement Plants by Location, Number of Employees, and Pollution Control Categories[a]

EPA District	Total plants (number)	Total employment	Average employees per plant	Pollution control categories: Nonleaching plants: X: No. of plants	X: No. of employees	Nonleaching plants: A: No. of plants	A: No. of employees	Leaching plants: C, CA, CH(1977): No. of plants	C, CA, CH(1977): No. of employees	Leaching plants: CD, D(1983): No. of plants	CD, D(1983): No. of employees
I	1	210	210			1	210				
II	10	2,257	226	3	550	7	1,707				
III	13[b]	2,540	195	7[b]	1,468	5	892	1	180		
IV	18[b]	2,710	150	7[b]	1,193	9[b]	1,236	1	158	1	123
V	12[b]	2,581	215	5[b]	846	5[b]	1,445	1[b]	70	1	220
VI	18[b]	2,383	132	8[b]	962	9	1,266	1	155		
VII	12	2,067	172	4	645	6	1,075	1	147	1	200
VIII	6	753	126	1	115	5	638				
IX	9	2,629	292	7	1,788	2	841				
X	4[b]	375	94	2	206	2[b]	169	—	—	—	—
Total	103	18,505		44	7,773	51	9,479	5	710	3	543
Average per plant			180		177		186		142		181

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. The 17 plants for which employment data were not available include 12 plants in the X category, four in the A category, and one plant in the C category of pollution controls.

One leaching plant in the C pollution category can meet 1977 standards with an estimated maximum expenditure of $15,000 as pollutants discharged are primarily in the form of excessive pH and reduction of suspended and dissolved solids is not required until 1983. The 55 nonleaching plants in the A pollution category and the three leaching plants with thermal problems will require the installation of a cooling tower or spray pond for control of solids and thermal pollution. By 1977, each of these plants will require an investment of up to $300,000, depending on the extent to which current equipment can be utilized, and annual outlays of almost $97,000. The C pollution category also includes 7 plants that will require the same A pollution control installation as nonleaching plants for their cement manufacture operations because these plants discharge excessive suspended, as well as dissolved, solids. Should these plants abandon their leachate systems by 1977, or choose the E alternative, the investment will be about the same as for A controls, but annual operating costs may total about $245,000. If leachate systems are retained, then C controls for the neutralization and settling of the leachate will be required, in addition to A controls, by 1977, at an additional capital cost of approximately $220,000 for each plant and additional annual costs of about $50,000.

1. Number of plants as percent of total

A summary of the data presented above on capacity, production, employment, and average productivity ratios for cement plants segmented by pollution control categories reveals a certain consistency that may be of some significance in implementing pollution standards. As indicated in Table 11, nonleaching plants in Category X, or those that are currently meeting 1977 pollution control standards, and leaching plants in Category C, or plants that will require the most extensive pollution controls by 1977, are similar in that both groups of plants account for a higher proportion of total plants than is accounted for by their proportion of total capacity, production, or employment. In contrast, leaching plants in Category D that will require no additional controls in 1977, leaching plants in Category C that will require minimal controls in 1977, and leaching and nonleaching plants in Categories C and A that will require A controls by 1977 account for a higher proportion of total capacity, production, or employment than indicated by their proportions of total plants. Average productivity per worker, however, is lower for both categories of nonleaching plants than for any category of leaching plants.

If, as the data indicate, nonleaching plants tend to have lower productivity per worker than leaching plants, one conclusion might be that leaching plants will be better able to cope with the greater costs of instituting pollution controls in 1977 and in 1983.

Table 11
Cement Industry by Number of Plants, Capacity, Production, Employment, and Productivity Ratios, Distributed by Pollution Control Categories[a]

		Pollution control categories			
		Nonleaching plants		Leaching plants	
	Total	X	A	C, CA, CH(1977)	CD, D(1983)
Number of plants, total	120	56	55	6	3
Percent of total plants[b]	100.0	45.5	43.9	6.5	1.6
Capacity in thousands of tons, total	69,329	30,119	33,650	3,190	2,370
Percent of total capacity	100.0	43.4	48.5	4.6	3.4
Production in tons/day, total	184,815	81,699	87,423	8,903	6,790
Percent of total production[b]	100.0	44.2	47.3	4.8	3.7
Number of employees, total[c]	18,505	7,773	9,479	710	543
Percent of total employment[b]	100.0	42.0	51.2	3.8	2.9
Annual average production, tons per man/day[c]	8.9	8.5	8.7	11.6	12.5

a. Sources: RAPP applications submitted by 88 cement plants to EPA and questionnaire responses, personal contacts, and visits to selected cement plants by staff of Southern Research Institute.

b. Percentages do not add to 100.0% because of rounding.

c. Only 103 plants are included because employment data were not available for 17 plants.

A similar inference might be derived from the average productivity ratios for polluting and nonpolluting nonleaching plants, but the difference is too small to be conclusive. It is, of course, also possible that the generally larger size of polluting plants may be attributable to modernization programs that the plants have instituted from funds not available to nonpolluting plants because of their capital and operating expenditures for pollution controls.

2. Production and employment as percents of totals

The percentages of the total industry represented by production and employment in the 120 plants under review are presented in Table 11 and discussed in the previous section. Detailed data on production and employment in plants grouped by location in EPA districts and segmented by pollution control categories are presented in Tables 8 and 10.

D. Significantly Impacted Segements of the Cement Industry

The segments of the cement industry affected most severely by pollution control standards are 1) companies with the greatest number of plants in the A and C pollution categories, but with a relatively strong financial base, and 2) companies with plants in the A and C pollution categories, but with relatively limited financial resources. This statement is based on a number of qualifying assumptions. The first is that the estimated investment and annual costs of reducing pollutant discharges are approximately equal for all nonleaching plants in the A pollution control category. Plants reported to be recycling or reusing water, or with wastewater treatment facilities, may have already installed at least part of the equipment required for pollution control and, as a result, the additional costs required may vary considerably.

Another assumption is that companies with leaching plants in the C and D pollution control categories will choose to retain their leachate systems rather than convert to nonleaching plants by adopting Alternative E. Capital costs for Alternative E are the same as for Alternative A, but dust disposal is estimated to add an additional $165,000 annually to the $97,000 estimated as operating costs for pollution control in nonleaching plants. Leaching plants that choose to retain their leachate systems and invest an additional $220,000 for neutralization and settling of the leachate (C) over and above the $300,000 required to install A controls may anticipate an additional expenditure of approximately $240,000 by 1983 to achieve the ultimate goal of controlling pollutant discharges (D). Only three leaching plants are reported to meet all 1977 requirements at the present time but

eight will require the complete C technology by 1983 for the further reduction of suspended solids and all nine must reduce dissolved solids by that year with the D control system.

The decision on whether to abandon leachate systems will depend on the ability of the companies with leaching plants to invest the initial capital required for the C alternative by 1977 or 1983. Those plants that are able to retain the systems will incur lower operating expenses, as well as the benefits of dust recovery, at a considerably lower total cost than those that choose Alternative E, or abandonment. The differences in operating costs of the two alternatives, in fact, will cover the installation of pollution controls to reduce dissolved solids (D) by 1983, and the higher operating costs involved in later years, but still be lower for plants that retain the leachate systems than for those that abandon them. As indicated on Table 12, total costs for both alternatives will be approximately equal in 1978 and higher each year thereafter for plants abandoning their leaching systems.

If it is assumed that A and C pollution controls will be implemented by 1977 and C and D controls by 1983, then those companies having the largest number of polluting plants will require the most sizable investments for pollution control. Companies with fewer polluting plants, however, generally lack the financial resources of the larger firms and may experience just as much difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds, despite the smaller amounts required.

Table 12
Total Estimated Cumulative Capital and Operating Costs for Leaching Plants under Pollution Control Alternatives C and E, 1977-1983[a]

			Retaining leaching system	Abandoning leaching system
1977	Capital	(C)	$ 520,000	$ 300,000
	Operating	(C)	146,500	262,000
			666,500	562,000
1978	Operating	(C)	146,500	262,000
			812,000	824,000
1979-1982	Operating	(C)	586,000	1,048,000
			1,398,000	1,872,000
1983	Capital	(D)	240,000	---
			1,638,000	1,872,000
	Operating	(D)	245,000	262,000
			$1,883,000	$2,134,000

a. Derived from estimates provided in Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, report prepared by Southern Research Institute, Birmingham, June 21, 1973 (revised).

III. FINANCIAL PROFILES

Cement companies, given the limitations of the financial data available for 1972 and assuming a relatively strong demand for cement during the coming decade, should generally experience relatively little difficulty in meeting pollution control standards set for 1977 and 1983. A majority of the companies reviewed appear to be financially capable of meeting all their estimated costs for pollution controls in 1977 from funds generated internally in 1972 alone.

Sources consulted for readily available information on financial structure included Dun and Bradstreet directories, Standard & Poor company stock reports, and annual reports published by companies engaged in cement manufacture. The available data covered 22 of the 35 companies for which plant data were available and 120 of their plants, 97 of which are reported by pollution control requirements.

There appears to be an adequate sampling of companies by number of plants in all pollution categories except for one-plant companies, only two of which are included in the financial profiles. The paucity of data for the other 10 one-plant companies is especially unfortunate because one plant is state operated and the other's outstanding financial performance was attributable to the gain from the sale of one of its plants in 1972.

Cement represents the total product of comparatively few companies in the cement industry. The only data generally available on the role of cement in these companies is the proportion of total sales accounted for by cement sales. This proportion f total sales was used to estimate the amount that cement plants contribute to their parent companies in total profits before taxes, in cash flow, and in current assets. The amounts attributable to cement were then divided by the total number of cement plants operated by each company to estimate the amount that might be allocated to each plant.

A. Plants in Each Segment

The summary of plants for which financial data are available, as presented in Table 13, indicates that the average nonleaching plant in the A pollution control category was more profitable, generated a greater cash flow, and had greater current assets than average nonleaching, nonpolluting plants in the X category. The average leaching plant in the C category of plants requiring limited pollution controls by 1977 was more profitable, generated a greater cash flow, and had greater current assets than the average leaching plant in the CD and D category that will not require pollution controls until 1983. The data for leaching plants are inconclusive because so few plants are involved.

Table 13
Estimated Total and Average-Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes, Cash Flow, and Value of Current Assets, from Cement Operations of Selected Companies by Pollution Control Categories[a]

	Total plants covered by financial data	Pollution status not known	Pollution control category				
			Total plants by pollution category	Nonleaching plants		Leaching plants	
				X	A	C, CA, CH (1977)	CD, D (1983)
Number of plants per category	120	23	97	43	47	5	2
			(in millions of dollars)				
Net profits before taxes, total	170.5	36.1	134.4	48.8	75.5	7.7	2.3
Average per plant	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.6	1.5	1.2
Estimated cash flow, total	143.5[b]	24.0	119.5	41.7[b]	68.2[b]	7.5	2.1
Average per plant	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.1
Value of current assets, total	580.0	116.7	463.3	230.0	225.8	24.0	7.6
Average per plant	4.8	5.1	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	3.8

a. Derived from company annual reports and Standard & Poor stock reports, 1972 for 22 companies operating 120 cement plants. Financial data include 23 plants for which data on polluting practices are not available and which are otherwise excluded from the scope of this study.

b. Cash flow could not be determined from data available.

Estimated capital and annual costs of meeting pollution control requirements in 1977 and 1983 are presented in Table 14 by category of plant. It is apparent that both capital and annual operating costs for eight of the nine leaching plants are more than twice as high as the costs for pollution control in nonleaching plants. All nonleaching plants, however, must meet water control standards by 1977, whereas some leaching plants, depending on the type and quantity of the pollutants discharged, may defer the installation of pollution controls to 1983.

1. Annual profits before taxes

All cement companies for which financial data were available were profitable in 1972 on an average-per-plant basis. When companies are arranged by number of plants, as in Table 15, however, estimated average net profits per plant appeared to be highest for companies with three plants (if the profits of the two one-plant companies are disregarded as not being representative of other one-plant companies). It may be recalled that companies with two or three plants also had a higher proportion of polluting plants than companies with either fewer or more plants. There does not appear to be any particular relationship between pollution category and net profits in companies with five or more plants. However, profit data do suggest that many of the cement companies with polluting plants are also among the most profitable and are apparently financially capable of meeting pollution control requirements.

2. Annual cash flow

Cash flow was computed by adding depreciation allowances to profits after taxes and subtracting an estimate of interest paid on long-term debt at a flat rate of eight percent, except when more precise debt and interest information was provided. Although a two-plant company appeared to generate the largest cash flow per plant, companies with six or seven plants, a majority of which were polluting plants, tended to have a higher average-per-plant cash flow than companies with more or fewer plants.

3. Market value of current assets

All of the cement companies for which data are available appear to have substantial current salvage assets per plant, but no consistent pattern is evident. The value of current assets per plant tends to vary as much by companies with different numbers of plants as it does for pollution control categories.

Table 14
Estimated Costs of Meeting Pollution Control Requirements in the Cement Industry by Pollution Control Categories, 1977 and 1983[a]

Pollution control category	Number of plants	Investment costs					
		1977		1983 (new or additional)		Total, 1983	
		Per plant	Total per category	Per plant	Total per category	Per plant	Total per category
X	56	-	-	-	-	-	-
A	55	$300,000	$16,500,000	-	-	$300,000	$16,500,000
C	2	520,000	1,040,000	$240,000	$ 480,000	760,000	1,520,000
CA	3	300,000	900,000	460,000	1,380,000	760,000	2,280,000
CH	1	15,000	15,000	745,000	745,000	760,000	760,000
CD	2	-	-	760,000	1,520,000	760,000	1,520,000
D	1	-	-	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Total	120		$18,455,000		$4,365,000		$22,820,000
		Annual operating costs					
X	56	-	-	-	-	-	-
A	55	$ 97,000	$ 5,335,000	-	-	$ 97,000	$ 5,335,000
C	2	146,500	293,000	98,500	197,000	245,000	490,000
CA	3	97,000	291,000	148,000	444,000	245,000	735,000
CH	1	5,000	5,000	240,000	240,000	245,000	245,000
CD	2	-	-	245,000	490,000	245,000	490,000
D	1	-	-	98,500	98,500	98,500	98,500
Total	120		$ 5,924,000		$1,469,500		$ 7,393,500

a. Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, report prepared by Southern Research Institute, Birmingham, June 21, 1973 (revised.)

Table 15
Estimated Average Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes, Cash Flow, and Value of Current Assets from Cement Operations of 20 Companies, 1972, by Pollution Control Categories[a]

Company	Total number of plants per company[b]	Plants by pollution control categories		Estimated net profits before taxes per plant	Estimated cash flow per plant	Estimated value of current assets per plant
		Number	Category	(in millions of dollars)		
Giant Portland Cement Co.	1	1	1X	7.1	4.7	18.4
South Dakota (State Plant)	1	1	1A	5.0	n.a.	5.0
OKC Corporation	2	1	1A	1.4	0.3	3.2
Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc.	2	2	2A	0.7	1.1	8.5
National Gypsum Company	2	2	2A	4.2	3.3	16.3
Missouri Portland Cement Co.	3	3	X,1CH,1D	2.0	1.9	4.8
Oregon Portland Cement Co.	3	3	1X,2A	2.5	n.a.	2.6
Louisville Cement Company	3	1	1A	2.9	2.2	5.5
California Portland Cement Co.	3	1	1A	4.9	0.2	9.2
The Flintkote Company	5	5	5X	0.4	0.6	2.5
Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corp.	5	3	3A	1.4	1.4	6.4
Southwestern Cement Co.	5	5	5X	1.2	n.a.	5.6
Alpha Portland Industries	6	5	2X,3A	0.4	2.8	2.8
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	6	5	2X,3A	1.8	2.1	6.3
Medusa Corporation	7	4	4A	1.0	1.3	3.9
Penn-Dixie Cement Corporation	7	2	1X,1CD	0.2	2.3	2.8
Amcord, Inc.	7	5	3X,1A,1CA	1.1	0.9	8.7
Martin Marietta Corp.	9	9	6X,3A	1.1	1.0	4.7
General Portland, Inc.	9	5	5A	1.4	1.1	4.3
Lone Star Industries, Inc.	11	11	7X,4A	1.0	1.0	4.7
Marquette Cement Mfg. Company	11	11	6X,4A,1C	0.2	0.6	2.9
Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.	14	12	3X,7A,1C,1CA	2.2	2.1	3.8

a. Derived from company annual reports and Standard and Poor stock reports, 1972.

b. Includes 23 plants of companies for which financial data are available but whose polluting status has not been reported.

4. Cost structure

Data on fixed and variable assets are not available in published form. Cost data for average cement plants were provided by J. D. Wilson in the aforementioned report on effluent limitation guidelines.[1]

B. Distribution of Plants by Pollution Categories

The distribution of cement plants by pollution categories was presented in Table 15. The available financial data suggest that all of the cement companies are capable of meeting the pollution standards set for 1977 and 1983. As indicated, the polluting companies with the lowest average net profits before taxes and cash flow per plant are the companies with the lowest pollution control expenditures required per plant. The non-polluting companies are not generally in as favorable a position in terms of profits as the polluting companies, but will also not be as directly affected by pollution control reqirements. As discussed later in this report, the four companies with plants in both the A and C categories that did not generate sufficient cash or profits in 1972 alone to cover the total investment for pollution controls required by 1977 were either undertaking ambitious modernization programs or were purchasing cement from other sources and reducing profit margins in an effort to maintain their market share.

C. Constraints in Financing

The constraints in financing water pollution control installations in cement companies are not likely to be too stringent. As indicated above, almost all the cement companies surveyed appear to be financially able to meet investment costs just from the profits and cash flows experienced in 1972, let alone from profits and cash flow of the next few years, and no diminution of the demand for cement is anticipated, at least before 1977. As indicated in the following section on prices, estimated annual costs for water pollution abatement are likely to be relatively minor in most instances, when computed on the basis of production per ton of cement.

---

1. Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, report prepared for U. S. Environmental Protection Agency by Southern Research Institute, June 21, 1973 (revised).

IV. PRICE DETERMINATION

A. How Prices are Determined in the Cement Industry

Because cement is a dense, bulky commodity, the cement industry is highly localized. Cement mills are often located close to quarries, from which raw materials are obtained, and the mills serve markets that are often less than 300 miles in radius. The industry in each marketing region can be characterized as oligopolistic, or dominated by relatively few producers, each of whom sells a largely undifferentiated product. The probability is that plants or firms with a relatively large market share in a given region, and located close to raw material reserves, as well as to the market, play a significant role in establishing price.

Price, at least in an initial sense, is likely to be based on a "cost plus" mechanism. According to this mechanism, for a level of output at or above the breakeven point, average direct cost per ton of cement is estimated and a given percentage of direct cost is added to direct cost to cover both fixed cost per ton and desired profit margin per ton. The price based on this formula may be called the normal price. The actual price per ton that a firm seeks to charge in a given location is the normal price, plus the published freight charge per ton from the mill to the given customer location, minus any discounts and allowances. Hence, the actual price (including freight) that a firm seeks to charge in a given location varies according to the customer location relative to the mill.

The firm that ordinarily sets the price as price leader usually has a cost advantage based on location and scale and is usually large in terms of local market share. Other firms that have less of a cost advantage and produce lower volumes of output will charge an actual price close to that of the actual price charged by the price leader. The normal price determined by the price leader in a given location is the price at which it presumably maximizes its profits (or minimizes its losses).

The process by which price determination is achieved by the price leader is graphically suggested in Figure 3, according to the comments of F. M. Sherer,[1] but this diagram has not been substantiated by detailed supporting data during the course of this study.

---

1. "Conditions Facilitating Oligopolistic Coordination", Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance, F.M. Sherer, Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1970.

Figure 3
Equilibrium Under Dominant Firm Price Leadership



Cement is a homogeneous product and there are often both large and small firms producing cement in a given market area. The dominant firm supplies a major portion of the market and the fringe of competitive firms supply the rest. The fringe of competitive firms is hypothesized to take the announced price of the dominant firm and produce a level of output at which marginal revenue (MR) and marginal cost (MC) are equal, whereupon short-run marginal cost rises to equality with price. The overall market demand curve in a given location is D'D. The supply curve for all the members of the competitive fringe, except the price leader, is S'S. At the price OS' that may be set by the dominant firm, the supply of output by the fringe of competitive firms, according to Sherer, is zero. At price OG, the competitive fringe supplies all the output demanded in the market with no output left over for the dominant firm. At price OS' the entire market is held by the dominant firm. Hence, the effective demand curve of the dominant firm (residual demand curve) is a kinked demand curve, GBD. The marginal revenue curve of the dominant firm is GMR. The price announced by the dominant firm is OP, at which the dominant firm maximizes its profits (MR=MC). The output produced and sold by the dominant firm is OX=PZ and the output produced by the fringe of competitive firms is ZA=PT. The total output supplied in the market is PA=(PZ + PT) and the overall local market is in equilibrium (supply=demand).

Although the dominant firm in practice may not exactly follow a path as illustrated in the graph, the dominant firm periodically revises its price and such price revision is generally followed by the fringe of competitive firms.

The leader and its fringe of competitors generally serve a market within a radius of about 200 miles, although large-scale plants often serve markets within about 300 miles. Prices do vary from small area to small area because, apart from varying raw material conditions and processing differences, freight charges are added to the normal price. The dominant firm may serve a market beyond 200 miles, thus encroaching upon markets in other locations. In such case, the dominant firm may absorb part of the profit to achieve penetration; may give discounts or easy credit; may provide retail distribution facilities, or may give any other non-price benefit to the customer. The cement firms in a given location may also ship to other distant locations in which there is short-run excess demand over supply.

B. Likelihood of Price Changes and Possible Secondary Effects

According to the distribution of cement plants by water pollution status, it is clear that in most local geographic markets

there are cement plants both with and without water pollution problems. Of all the alternative pollution control methods, Alternative E has the highest estimated additional annual cost of implementing water pollution control. Extra annual costs of implementing alternative pollution control methods are given below:

Alternative Pollution Control Methods

	A	C	D	E
Extra annual average cost per short ton	$0.24	$0.40	$0.69	$0.75

These figures are arrived at by dividing the estimated incremental total annual costs per plant for each alternative by average output. The average cost per short ton was estimated as $15.91. Average mill prices[1] per short ton, average city prices, and average area prices in the United States are about $24.28, $26.00, and $27.90, respectively (see Figure 4). The difference between the average mill price and the city or area price is presumed to be reflective of freight, storage, and related charges. The average estimated additional cost for Alternative A (installation of cooling tower or spray pond and containment of runoff from dust piles is $0.24 per short ton; for Alternative C (recycle and reuse) it is $0.40; for Alternative D (same as C, plus electrodialysis of leachate to reduce TDS and recycling of leachate) it is $0.69; and for Alternative E (abandonment of dust leaching) it is $0.75.

Whether or not the demand curve shifts upwards, the primary impact of implementing water pollution control methods is most likely to be an increase in prices, however limited these increases may be and however these increases may vary from one local market to the next. The reasoning relative to the increase in prices is illustrated graphically in Figure 5.

Suppose the price leader has a plant without water pollution control problems and suppose one or all the competitive fringe firms in a given market area have to implement water pollution control methods. Then the supply curve of the competitive fringe will be shifted downwards from S_1S_1 to S_2S_2 and, hence, the demand curve of the price leader and marginal revenue of the price leader will be shifted upwards. The result will be an increase in price charged by the price leader and the other firms. The price increase is most likely to occur, however, when the price leader has to implement water pollution control methods.

---

1. Engineering News Record, "Monthly Market Quotation," August 9, 1973.

Figure 4
Selected Prices of Bulk Cement[a]
(in dollars per CWT)



a. Engineering News Record, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Hightstown, August 9, 1973. Prices are quoted after deduction for discounts and include city, mill, and area averages.

Figure 5
Equilibrium Under Dominant Firm Price Leadership
Before and After Cost Increases of Competitive Fringe Firms



Although the extent of the price increases cannot be predicted accurately, such increases, in terms of average current area prices in the United States for alternate pollution control categories, are estimated as 0.86 percent for the A category; 1.43 percent for C; 2.47 percent for D; and 2.68 percent for E. The number of plants in category A (55) is similar to the number of plants (56) without water pollution problems. The number of plants in categories C, D, and E is small. Hence, the increase in overall price because of the implementation of water pollution problems appears to be insignificant.

As a result, meaningful secondary effects in the industry are likely to be rather limited.

To the extent that some polluting plants experience an increase in variable costs, however minor, their preferred level of output will decline. But that decline in output (and sales), should it occur, is likely to be matched by an increase in output (and sales) of nonpolluters. Thus, some changes in factor employment or utilization may take place. If small plants lose sales to larger, more efficient plants, some small net loss in employment may ensue in a local market.

To the extent that costs of some polluting plants increase and if those plants choose to absorb the increase and not seek to raise prices, a decline in profits may then follow. This should be followed in turn by a reduction, however small, in state and federal corporate income taxes. To the extent that increased depreciation is involved as a result of installing new pollution control facilities, a decline in profits should be partially offset by increased cash flow.

V ASSESSMENT OF ECONOMIC IMPACT OF POLLUTION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS ON THE CEMENT INDUSTRY

A. Best Practicable Control Technology Currently Available

The technology for implementing pollution control standards in the cement industry by 1977 is not only available and practicable, but is already operating in approximately half the 120 cement plants for which data are available. The 44 plants which have not been reviewed are also plants that have not applied for RAPP applications, suggesting that they may in fact not be discharging pollutants at this time.

B. Best Available Control Technology Economically Achievable

The most economically achievable technology for achieving essentially no discharge of pollutants in cement plants with leaching systems has not yet been determined. An electrodialysis process has been suggested, but its suitability for cement plants has not been tested. All cement plants with leaching systems, however, can at about the same level of additional capital expenditures as nonleaching plants, achieve no discharge of pollutants by abandoning their leaching systems and instituting the same pollution control procedures as nonleaching plants. This, however, will result in increased annual costs. Only one leaching plant has achieved the maximum level of pollution control attainable by technology currently available. Leaching plants may also achieve a nonpolluting status in 1977 by abandoning their leachate systems, at least until such time as economically achievable control technology is developed.

C. New Source Standards

Standards for new sources of effluent discharges into navigable streams apparently need only be set at 1977 levels to insure that all new cement plants achieve essentially no discharge of pollutants by avoiding the use of leaching systems. Should new plants with leachate systems be built, they would have to meet the standards in effect at the time of construction.

D. New Source Pretreatment Standards

Pretreatment standards for new sources discharging process wastes into municipal sewer systems should be basically similar to the standards set for new sources discharging into navigable streams. Inasmuch as these municipal water treatment facilities have their own guidelines or limitations on allowable discharges, and few currently permit any cement plant discharges except sanitary wastes into their systems, the issue may be academic.

VI. IMPACT ANALYSIS

The economic impact of pollution control standards on the cement industry, based on data available for 35 companies and 120 plants, will involve a strain on the internal financial resources of some companies with polluting cement plants and only negligible increases in cement prices in most sections of the country. No general curtailments of production and no general manpower layoffs are anticipated as a direct result of pollution control requirements. Should the demand for cement soften relative to supply, however, a few of the more inefficient and financially weak polluting plants located close to nonpolluting plants may be among the first to be abandoned.

Recent trends in the cement industry may discourage the construction of new plants, especially new plants with leaching systems. However, Department of Commerce sources have indicated knowledge of six or seven new cement plants, either under construction or being planned with completions in 1974 or 1975.

A. Price Effects

It has already been established in the preceding section on prices that the annual average increase in operating costs per ton resulting from pollution control installation is estimated at $0.24 per ton for the 55 nonleaching plants in the A category, and $0.40 per ton for 6 leaching plants in the C category by 1977. The annual average operating costs for all plants in the C category and the three leaching plants currently meeting 1977 standards, it was estimated, will increase to $0.69 per ton at the time the 1983 standards for no discharge of pollutants are implemented.

1. Price increase

All other things remaining the same, these increased annual average costs, including interest and depreciation allowances, as was pointed out, may generally be expected to result in average cement price increases of less than 1% (0.86) for plants in the A category, of less than 1.5% (1.43) for plants in the C category, and less than 2.5% (2.47) for leaching plants meeting 1983 standards. Leaching plants choosing to abandon leachate systems may anticipate additional annual average costs of $0.75 per ton, requiring average cement price increases of a little less than 2.75% (2.68).

Estimated increases in operating expenditures as a result of pollution control requirements, however, may not, as suggested, actually result in increased prices to consumers. Part of the cost increases arising from water pollution control efforts may be absorbed in whole or in part in numerous markets across the country by cement plants located in close proximity to nonpolluting plants, if the polluting plants choose to retain their competitive market sales position. On the other hand, the domination of any local market area by polluting companies may be reflected in slightly higher prices by all cement plants, as the nonpolluting companies may also choose to raise their prices to the same level as polluting companies, especially in the face of strong demand, and increase their profits, rather than attempt to encroach on the market held by the dominant companies.

2. Secondary effects

The full range of secondary effects from price increases arising from increased costs due to pollution control efforts may include changes in the following: market share of competitors in close proximity to each other; production and employment in the various competitive plants; scale of operations of either polluters or nearby nonpolluters; profits and internal cash generation; and consumption of cement and its substitutes.

To the extent that plants experiencing such cost increases operate in local markets where nonpolluters are also located, as is the case in many areas across the nation, price increases may be forestalled, as already pointed out, and the polluting firms may be obliged to absorb such increased costs, thus sharing those increased costs between themselves and income tax collecting agencies. A rise in depreciation expenses should tend to mitigate somewhat a decline in cash flow. Should these firms choose to curtail their own production and employment and thus avoid some part of the increase in costs, that part of demand not satisfied would likely be transferred to other firms, which in turn will face the option of increasing their capacity and improving their production, thus experiencing at least a relative decline in their costs and prices.

The polluting companies, however, are often those with modernized plants and relatively high productivity. Faced with the prospect of rising short-run average total costs for pollution control in a period of relatively strong demand, these polluting firms may choose to expand their capacity and improve their productivity even further, thus protecting their shares of the market and their profitability.

If a transfer of output does occur from low-productivity to high-productivity plants in given local markets as a result of increases in average total costs arising from pollution control efforts, there may follow a minor reduction in overall employment.

To the extent that price increases arising from pollution control efforts remain negligible or, at worst, minor, resulting changes in the amount of cement consumed, in the amount of cement substitutes consumed, and in the volume of construction, should likewise be negligible or minor. Imposition of pollution controls on industries producing cement substitutes should serve to minimize further the extent of change in employment, output, and use of cement arising from the imposition of water pollution controls in the cement industry.

B. Financial Effects

The financial data covered in this report are all as of 1972, a year in which demand for cement was relatively strong, plants tended to operate at or near capacity, and profits apparently were generally high. The demand for cement from 1970 to 1980 has been estimated to increase at a 3% annual rate in Rock Products[1], and at a 3.3% annual rate in Predicasts[2]. Engineering News Record[3] has forecast an increase of 6% in profits before taxes for the cement industry as a whole between 1972 and 1973. Thus, 1972 may be considered a representative year for the decade of the 1970's for the cement industry.

---

1. Rock Products, McLean-Hunter Publishing Company, Chicago, December, 1972, p 68.

2. Predicasts, Predicasts, Inc., Cleveland, April 27, 1973, p A-17.

3. Engineering News Record, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Hightstown, March 15, 1973, p 61.

1. Profitability

Profit data for 22 of the 35 companies with cement plants for which pollution data are available suggest that all cement companies experienced substantial profits in 1972. The proportion of total company profits before taxes attributed to cement plants only has been estimated on the basis of the proportion of cement sales to total company sales, rather than to the actual contribution of cement plants to net profits. This proportion is, therefore, only a rough approximation based on limited data about the larger companies, but represents the only data generally available. Percentages based on sales may even be somewhat conservative because, for the two companies for which the proportion of cement net profits to total net profits was also reported, one was higher (by 10%) and one was lower (by 0.3%) than the percentages based on sales.

As indicated in Table 16, all companies for which data are presented and which operate cement plants experienced a profit in 1972, although estimated average net profit before taxes per cement plant varied from $0.16 million per plant for a company with eleven plants to $4.19 million for a company with two plants. The one-plant company with net profits after taxes of $7.1 million is not considered representative of other one-plant companies, as explained earlier in this report.

Net profits before taxes from cement operations totaled an estimated $170.5 million in 1972 for the 22 companies for which data were available. Annual operating costs for pollution controls, including the costs of capital, operation and maintenance, energy and power, and depreciation, were estimated to total $5.1 for these companies in 1977, or 3.0% of cement plant profits in 1972, and $6.2 million, or 3.6% of 1972 profits in 1983. These annual costs constitute a relatively small percentage of annual profits in most companies reported and should not adversely affect profitability to any great extent.

On a per-plant basis, however, one company is estimated to require a greater amount for annual operating expenses for pollution controls in 1977 than its estimated profits before taxes per cement plant in 1972. This same firm recently abandoned one nonleaching plant, but the plant was not discharging pollutants. It may, however, have contributed to the company's relatively poor profits in 1972.

The 22 companies for which financial data are provided account for approximately 87% of the total annual expenditures estimated for the entire industry and for approximately 85% of the total estimated capital investment required in 1977 for pollution controls. Although the financial data presented in this study are limited to about half of all companies in the industry, annual reports received from almost every comapny with cement plants indicated that cement operations were profitable in 1972.

Table 16
Cement Companies by Estimated Capital and Annual Operating Costs for Pollution Controls, 1977 and 1983, and Average -Per-Plant Net Profits before Taxes and Cash Flow, 1972[a]
(in millions of dollars)

Company	Plants by pollution control categories	Estimated net profits before taxes per plant, 1972	Estimated annual operating costs for pollution control		Estimated cash flow per plant, 1972	Estimated capital costs for pollution control	
			1977	1983		1977	1983
Alpha	2X,3A	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.8	0.9	-
Amcord	2X,1A,1CA	1.1	0.2	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.5
Ash Grove	2A	n.a.	0.2	0.2	n.a.	0.6	-
Atlantic	1A	n.a.	0.1	0.1	n.a.	0.3	-
California	1A	4.9	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	-
Columbia	1A	n.a.	0.1	0.1	n.a.	0.3	-
Dundee	1CD	n.a.	-	0.2	n.a.	-	0.8
Flintkote	5X	0.4	-	-	0.6	-	-
General	5A	1.4	0.5	0.5	1.1	1.5	0
Grant	1X	7.1	-	-	4.7	-	-
Gulf Coast	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
Ideal	3X,7A,1CA,1C	2.2	0.9	1.2	2.1	2.9	0.7
Kaiser	3A	1.4	0.3	0.3	1.4	0.9	-
Lehigh	2X,3A	1.8	0.3	0.3	2.1	0.9	-
Lone Star	7X,4A	1.0	0.4	0.4	1.0	1.2	-
Louisville	1A	2.9	0.1	0.1	2.2	0.3	-
Marquette	6X,4A,1C	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.7	0.2
Martin Marietta	6X,3A	1.1	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.9	-
Medusa	4A	1.0	0.4	0.4	1.3	1.2	-
Mississippi	1A	n.a.	0.1	0.1	n.a.	0.3	-
Missouri	1X,1CH,1D	2.0	-	0.2	1.9	-	0.7
Monarch	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
National Cement	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
National Gypsum	2A	4.2	0.2	0.2	3.3	0.6	-
National Portland	1CA	n.a.	0.2	0.2	n.a.	0.3	0.5
OKC	1A	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	-
Oregon	1X,2A	2.5	0.2	0.2	5.0	0.6	-
Penn-Dixie	1X,1CD	0.2	-	0.2	0.2	-	0.8
Puerto Rican	2A	0.7	0.2	0.2	1.0	0.6	-
San Juan	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
Santee	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
South Dakota	1A	5.0	0.1	0.1	n.a.	0.3	-
Southwestern	5X	1.2	-	-	n.a.	-	-
Universal-Atlas	7X,3A	n.a.	0.3	0.3	n.a.	0.9	-
Whitehall	1X	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	-	-
Total			5.9	7.4		18.5	4.4

a. Financial data were derived from company annual reports and Standard & Poor stock reports, 1972. Estimates of capital and annual costs for pollution control were derived from Development Document for Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance, report prepared by Southern Research Institute, Birmingham, June 21, 1973 (revised).

b. Includes sales of all construction materials.

c. Excludes extraordinary items.

n.a. Not available.

2. Capital availability

Cash flow represents the internal generation of funds, or, as defined in earlier sections of this report, the sum of net income after taxes and depreciation less interest payments. The ease with which companies may raise funds from outside sources, particularly in periods of high interest rates and limited availability of funds, is an aspect of capital availability that has been omitted from this study.

As indicated on Table 16, the estimated average cash flow generated in 1972 per cement plant for companies for which selected data are available is less than the estimated required capital expenditures for pollution control in 1977 in four companies. Noting that there are four years remaining to 1977, all of these companies can readily generate sufficient internal funds to pay for these pollution control investments, but obviously, this may impinge on other necessary investments and distributions. These companies, however, all have substantial resources. In the expectation of a continued strong demand for cement, three are engaged in or planning to increase capacity, rather than to shut down operations. The fourth purchased more than a half-million tons of cement from outside sources in 1972 to meet consumer demand.

One of these companies was previously mentioned as also having lower profitability per plant in 1972 than might be required for annual operating costs for pollution control by 1977. The company has been actively engaged in enlarging capacity in its plants in recent years, using both internally generated and borrowed funds. Although ten of the twelve plants owned by the company in 1972 were more than twenty years old, only one nonpolluting, non-leaching plant was abandoned in the process (in 1973). One company has been undergoing a major management reorganization and operations at two of its plants were suspended in 1973. Nevertheless, the company was able to negotiate a bank loan for $20 million in 1972 for consolidation of its debts, suggesting that its operations are basically solvent. Another had been financing capital outlays through internally generated funds until 1972, but anticipates having to borrow to finance estimated capital outlays of $37 million in 1973. Some part of these outlays may well be for water pollution controls.

C. Production Effects

As indicated above, expansion, rather than curtailment of productive facilities has been the goal of most cement companies, especially in more recent years, and this process is expected to be continued for the rest of this decade. Although cement production is apparently currently profitable, companies are building

few new facilities, but rather are modernizing older plants in their effort to increase capacity and ostensibly improve their cost standing. In a general sense, capital expenditures for required water pollution controls appear to be almost negligible when compared with outlays for larger kilns, for example. Annual operating costs for water pollution control are similarly minor compared to annual profitability. Pollution control standards, if enforced during a period of strong demand for cement, are not likely to have a serious negative economic impact on the cement industry, so far as can be determined. Should the demand for cement decrease after 1977, as it did during the 1960's, the only plants not pollutant free at that time will be those with leaching systems, which represent a minor percentage of total plants and capacity in the industry.

D. Employment Effects

Given these findings, there is little reason to expect significant adverse effects on employment in the cement industry nationally as a result of the imposition of water pollution control standards. As suggested above, in the discussion of secondary effects of price increases, the probability is that adverse effects on production and employment, to the extent they may occur are likely to be highly localized in nature, as well as limited in effect.

To provide a more detailed market-by-market analysis of production and employment effects would require far greater data than was obtained for this study on individual plant scale, economics, and finances.

E. Resultant Community Effects

As indicated above, the major community effects will be clean water and its attendant benefits, as neither plant closings nor unemployment are likely to result per se from the imposition of water pollution control requirements.

F. Effects on International Trade

Portland cement is neither imported nor exported in sufficient quantity to affect in any meaningful way our balance of payments situation. Although the quantity of cement imported has increased every year since 1968, imports in 1972 amounted to less than five million tons, or 5.3% of domestic output. This quantity was valued at $71 million. Exports have not exceeded 200,000 tons annually for at least the past five years.

These increases in imports, although very likely concentrated in water oriented markets, suggest that tightness of local supply relative to growing demand may have been the primary factor at work. Satisfying water pollution abatement requirements, it has been suggested earlier in this report, is not likely to result in curtailment of supply in local markets, nor is it likely to result in significantly increased prices. Thus, there is relatively little likelihood that disproportionate increases in imports of cement are likely to occur as a result of meeting water pollution abatement requirements.

VII. LIMITS OF THE ANALYSIS AND IDENTITY OF MAJOR INFORMATION SOURCES

This study covers only 120, or 73% of the 164 cement plants active in 1973, and an estimated 73% of the total capacity and production in the cement industry. The 120 plants that are analyzed include 88 plants with RAPP applications in 1970 or 1971 and 35 plants surveyed by Southern Research Institute through questionnaires and plant visits during the spring of 1973. Information on the cement industry as a whole was obtained from the published sources listed in the Bibliography. The major sources for company financial data were publications of Dun and Bradstreet and Standard & Poor and annual reports of cement-producing companies, as well as trade journals. Cement price information was also obtained by telephone contacts with a limited number of personnel of companies involved in the cement industry.

A. Accuracy

Verification by spot checks of the data reported by plants in questionnaire responses and RAPP applications revealed a number of minor discrepancies in the technical report that have been corrected for this report. Most of these errors involved changes of 10 tons more or less in capacity and daily production. More significantly, two plants, originally classified as non-leaching plants have been reclassified as leaching plants because they use a wet-scrubber process. As a result, all references in this economic impact report to plants by pollution categories are deemed to be correct. None of these revisions, however, substantially affected the conclusions reached in this study.

B. Range of Error

There are two major possible sources of error that could not be avoided within the time and cost limitations of this study. One is the use of price information as of a specific date. Current prices, as reported in Engineering News Record vary by locality from month to month. One month prices, whether reported as FOB city, by mill, or by area, may reflect only a temporary local situation. The use of an average price, however, whether by locality or over time, would tend to distort regional prices or conceal price trends. The decision to use the latest available prices was considered to be the most expedient method of resolving the issue.

The second significant source of error arises from the technique used to estimate the proportion of a company's net profits before taxes, value of current assets, and cash flow that might be allocated to cement plants by pollution categories. Some companies make no distinction between cement and other operations, some do not separate cement from other construction materials, and a few report net profits, as well as net sales, from their cement plants. The majority, however, report revenues from cement sales, either by amount, or as a percentage, of total sales. This percentage was applied to the net profits, current assets, and cash flow of companies to determine the amount that might be allocable to cement operations. The amount computed was then divided by the total number of cement plants owned by a company to obtain an admittedly rough estimate of the average finances per plant in that company. This methodology is simple, but the explicit use of sales as a measure of the contribution of cement activities to the overall financial structure should be subjected to further validation.

C. Critical Assumptions - Sensitivity to Overall Conclusions

The critical assumptions in this study, to which the conclusions of this study are tied, involve the following points:

- nature of effluent discharges, nature of requirements for achieving essentially no discharge of pollutants, and nature of control technologies.

- costs, both capital and annual, for controlling pollutants for attaining essentially no discharge of pollutants; such costs are implicitly dependent on the available technology

- local or regional nature of cement markets and dispersion of polluting and nonpolluting cement plants in many local or regional markets across the nation

- oligopolistic nature of, including product homogeneity and, in most local or regional markets, the probability of price leadership

- high frequency of polluters among moderate and large-

size companies that are apparently enjoying fairly good profits and cash flow

- relatively strong demand for cement compared to supply in the nation and in many local or regional markets currently, a condition that is expected to continue for some time

- proclivity of cement companies to modernize and expand capacity, rather than build new plants

Taken together, these points and the introduction of quantifying and qualifying facts about them, lead to the conclusion that generally, across the nation, the economic impact of costs for achieving water pollution control standards will tend to be negligible, and that problems that do arise will tend to be minor in their effects and highly localized. A relaxation of the assumptions will necessarily force changes in the conclusions.

D. Unanswered Questions

The primary unanswered questions pertain to the following:

- the actual additional costs that are likely to be experienced by individual plants in their effort to meet standards

- the specific economic character, including price levels, of the many local cement markets and the actual role of polluting and nonpolluting plants in these markets

- the actual financial status of the various polluting plants and their parent companies

The nature of the information available thus far and presented in this report, however, leads to the conclusion that the conclusions about the economic impact of water pollution standards are reasonable and defensible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Cement Directory 1972, Bradley Pulverizer Company, April, 1972.

2. The Cement Industry: Economic Impact of Pollution Control Costs, prepared by the Boston Consulting Group for the U. S. Environment Protection Agency, November, 1971.

3. Commodity Data Summaries, Bureau of Mines, U. S. Department of the Interior, January, 1973, pp 114-115.

4. Development of Data and Recommendations for Industrial Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards of Performance: Cement Manufacturing Industry, prepared by Southern Research Institute Institute for the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, June 21, 1973 (revised).

5. Dun and Bradstreets Million Dollar Directory, Dun and Bradstreet, Inc., New York, 1973.

6. Engineering News Record, "Monthly Market Quotations by ENR Field Reporters", McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Hightstown, January-August, 1973.

7. _____, "Industry Looks for Heftier Profits", March 15, 1973, p 61.

8. F. M. Sherer, Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance", Conditions Facilitating Oliogopolistic Coordination", Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1970.

9. Industry Week, "Low Profits, Pollution Costs to Bring More Cement Shortages", Penton Publishing Company, Cleveland, May 21, 1973, p 67.

10. Predicasts, Predicasts, Inc., Cleveland, April 27, 1973, pp 17-18.

11. Rock Products, "Cement Today", Maclean-Hunter Publishing Corporation, Chicago, Vol 76, No. 5, May, 1973, p 75.

12. _____, "The Year Ahead", Vol 75, No. 5, December, 1972, p 53.

13. _____, "Cement: Shipments from Mills Set New Highs", Vol. 76, No. 5, December, 1973, pp 40-43.

14. U. S. Industrial Outlook 1972 with Projections to 1980, Bureau of Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1973.

BIBLIOLGRAPHY (Cont'd)

15. Standard and Poor Company Stock Reports (no annual report available):

Amcord, Inc.
California Portland Cement Company

16. 1972 Annual Reports:

Alpha Portland Industries, Inc.
Centex Cement Corporation
Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co.
The Flintkoke Company
General Portland, Inc.
Giant Portland Cement Company
Gifford-Hill and Company, Inc.
Gulf Coast (McDonough Co.)
Ideal Basic Industries, Inc.
Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corporation
Keystone Portland Cement Company
Lehigh Portland Cement Company
Louisville Cement Company
Lone Star Industries
Marquette Cement Manufacturing Company
Martin Marietta Corporation
Medusa Corporation
Missouri Portland Cement Company
National Cement Company (The Mead Corp.)
National Gypsum Company
OKC Corporation
Oregon Portland Cement Comapny
Penn-Dixie Cement Corporation
Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc.
Southwestern Portland Cement Co. (Southdown)
Universal-Atlas Division, United States Steel Corporation